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ABSTRACT

The current study explores models of parenting constructs in a sample of contemporary urban Ghanaian adults who are raising at least one child between the ages of five and twelve years old. Parenting practices that include high levels of responsiveness to children’s needs, as well as high levels of demandingness and firm limits, have been associated with a range of positive outcomes in youth in the United States, Canada, and Western European countries. This parenting style, termed Authoritative parenting, has been promoted by public and private institutions in Euro-American societies for close to forty years. However, research on cultural minority groups in Euro-American dominated cultures suggests that firmer parenting styles with higher demandingness and other related features are practiced among African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latinos in the United States, based on both contextual and cultural influences.

Current results indicated that parenting styles formulated in Euro-American, Chinese, and Indian studies did not completely capture self-reported parenting practices among Ghanian parents. Three modified constructs of Ghanaian parenting practices emerged from the quantitative data, including: (1) Responsiveness-Cherishing, in which parents endorsed high levels of support and freedom of expression for their child, in combination with high levels of demandingness, accompanied by parental control through guilt, as well as high levels of parental expression of caring emotion; (2)
Restrictiveness-Containment, in which parents endorsed strong behavioral and emotional control, with firm limits for the purpose of protecting children from harmful extra-familial influences; and (3) Restrictiveness-Intradependence, in which parents placed strong emphasis on collectivist unity and hierarchy of power within the family and community. Demographic and qualitative data related each of these constructs to cultural and contextual factors within Ghanaian societies. Current findings set the stage for further research on culturally-specific features of Ghanaian parenting styles, their relationships to youth outcomes, and the role such styles can play in behavioral, religious, and public health programs.
CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

Parenting and family dynamics have long been a focus of psychological inquiry, and parenting practices have a significant impact on the formation of child behaviors. Published scientific research on families and child-rearing has attempted to quantify those features of parenting that lead to good or poor outcomes (Barber, Stolz, & Olsen, 2005). Most of this research has been conducted by researchers in European and North American academic institutions (in Western Europe, the United States, and Canada), with primarily Caucasian, middle income families. The findings of this body of research have led to stable findings regarding effective parenting as well as problematic behaviors in these families; however, evidence from studies of ethnic minorities in Euro-American cultures has demonstrated that cultural and contextual influences strongly impact parenting practices and child outcomes. (Here forward, the term Euro-American will refer to persons of Western European cultural, but not necessarily ethnic, heritage in Europe and the northern parts of North America.) The purpose of this study is to evaluate self-reported parenting style in Ghana, to determine how well parenting practices of urban Ghanaian families fit models of parenting obtained in Euro-American culture, and to uncover what specific features parents in Ghana may endorse.

In the West African nation of Ghana, the family is considered the strongest social institution, affecting emotional, cognitive, and social development, as well as vocational
networks and political associations. Yet very little psychological research has examined the parameters and emotional impact of Ghanaian family life. The primary goal of this proposed research is to determine how approaches to parenting in Ghana are similar to and different from parenting constructs that have been studied in Euro-American cultures.

In the following chapter, the research on parenting styles in Euro-American cultures will be reviewed, as well as limitations in the application of this literature. Research and theories on cultural variations on parenting styles will be reviewed, and the potential links between this literature and parenting styles in Ghana will be discussed. Next, international explorations of parenting styles will be reviewed. As a context for the current study, the philosophies of intercultural psychological research will be summarized. Next, intercultural research in West Africa and Ghana specifically will be reviewed. A brief primer on Ghana and Ghanaian cultures is provided to familiarize readers with the context of this study. Finally, research questions and hypotheses for the present study will be explained.
CHAPTER II:
LITERATURE REVIEW

Euro-American Constructs of Parenting

In general, psychological research on parenting often conceptualizes the parent-child relationship as some combination of support and rejection of the youth’s behavior and emotions (Rohner & Britner, 2002). Diane Baumrind’s (1967) constructs of responsiveness and restrictiveness are widely regarded as the underlying theoretical factors that define parenting typologies in the research literature.

Authoritative Parenting

The parenting style that is most strongly linked to positive youth outcomes in Euro-American cultures is authoritative. Baumrind conceptualized this style as parenting practices that are highly responsive to a child’s opinions, supportive to a child’s emotions, and encouraging of dialogue regarding disciplinary practices. At the same time, authoritative parenting sets firm boundaries on a child’s conduct, and demands the child to behave in a manner consistent with the parents’ wishes. The combination of high responsiveness and high restrictiveness results in a democratic style of parenting in which parents foster the child’s understanding of expected behaviors and consequences. Thus, authoritative parents tend to express low levels of psychological control in a democratic style of family authority. This style assigns responsibilities that are matched to a child’s...
maturity level, while simultaneously meeting the child’s needs and encouraging individual strengths. Such parents’ interactions with children emphasize in explanatory style of communication with high levels of reciprocity and nurturance (Baumrind, 1967, 1993; Collins & Laursen, 2005). Parents employ effective, reciprocal communication to instill progressively greater levels of responsibility in the child to meet personal needs as well as the needs of others (Maccoby, 1994).

Evidence from research in the United States reveals that this style of parenting is most often associated with higher academic performance, lower levels of risk-taking, stronger self-concept, and better mental health outcomes than other styles of parenting (Barber et al., 2005; Steinberg et al., 1996). Overall, authoritative parents set firm boundaries for children, and invest time in explaining the reasons behind house rules. Figure 1 illustrates the dimensions of responsiveness and restrictiveness for each of Baumrind’s parenting styles. In this model, parents may endorse features of responsiveness, including emotional support, encouraging freedom of expression, and encouraging autonomy, as well as features of restrictiveness, including firm limits on behavior, obedience to parents’ demands, and expectations of child achievement. In Baumrind’s model, parents who endorse high levels of responsiveness and restrictiveness have high expectations of their children’s behavior, but also provide a supportive environment to help children meet those expectations. This style is termed Authoritative, and is characterized by support, firm limits, and tends to include a democratic dialogue around conflicts. Research on parenting in Euro-American (Western European, Canadian, and United States majority groups) cultures has shown a predominate style in
which parents set firm limitations in conjunctions with providing supportive responses to children’s wishes.

Figure 1. Baumrind’s Parenting Styles

Authoritarian Parenting

Authoritarian parenting style is characterized by high demandingness and low responsiveness to the child’s needs and abilities (see Figure 1). In Euro-American studies, authoritarian parents prioritize their own desires over the child’s developmental needs (Baumrind, 1967). Such parents tend to invoke harsh discipline to assert their dominance, with little explanation of the limits or reasoning for limits that they set for their children (Collins & Laursen, 2005). Often, authoritarian parents are guided by strong moral or philosophical beliefs emphasizing their absolute control over children’s behavior (Baumrind, 1967). Research in the United States demonstrates that authoritarian parenting is commonly associated with high behavioral and psychological
control of children. This type of parent-child relationship leads to tension, and is associated with increase internalizing problems in girls, and externalizing problems in both genders, and poor school performance (Steinberg et al., 1996; Barber et al., 2005). Researchers explain this finding by theorizing that parents who are stern and demanding, without teaching their children the rationale behind house rules, instill a fear of authority in children, rather than helping them internalize prosocial values. Under this parenting style, moral development is based on conventional judgments congruent with authority, rather than logical comparison of behavioral choices (Leahy, 1981). Consequently, children do not learn mature behaviors; instead, they learn how to obey authority without understanding the meaning behind their actions, or how to rebel and avoid getting caught acting out (Baumrind, 1967).

Authoritarian parenting tends to be associated with negative outcomes in Euro-American research, and therefore may take on a pejorative cast. The term authoritarian itself conjures an image of an autocratic, unjust ruler, such as a dictator. In Euro-American cultures, this term connotes a negative impression of autocracy and harsh parenting. Research supports the notion that authoritarian parenting in Euro-American culture families tends to be related to rebellion in adolescence, as youth seek autonomy and greater freedom (Steinberg et al., 1994). However, many studies have demonstrated that this pattern does not necessarily apply to families who are not Euro-American heritage (McLoyd, 2002). This act of overthrowing an unjust system, be in a parent or a colonial power, is much romanticized in Euro-American culture; thus, the term selected by Euro-American researchers to describe the practices which make up the authoritarian
parenting style demonstrates their unfavorable impression towards strong parental control without freedom of expression for children.

Permissive Parenting

Baumrind conceptualized a third parenting style characterized by low demandingness, termed permissive parenting. The permissive parent imposes low levels of demands on the child, either indulging the young person’s whims or neglecting him or her altogether (Baumrind, 1967). Maccoby & Martin (1983) differentiated these two profiles of permissive parenting into permissive-indulgent and permissive-neglectful. Research has supported this distinction, demonstrating that each style has different outcomes for children (Lanborn, Mounts, Stienberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). Permissive-indulgent parenting involves low demandingness and high responsiveness. Children raised by permissive-indulgent parents tend to exhibit more behavior problems and difficulty conforming to academic expectations than their peers, but experience greater self-esteem and better social skills than children from other types of families (Darling, 1999). Permissive-neglectful parenting style is characterized by low demandingness and low responsiveness. House rules and expectations are generally ambiguous or deemphasized. Permissive-neglectful parenting is associated with poor parent-child attachment, child withdrawal, and internalizing disorders, as well as low performance in social and academic domains (Darling, 1999).
Limitations of Parenting Research

Baumrind’s parenting typologies have undergone some minor revisions over the past four decades, but research studies in Euro-American cultures tend to reinforce the results that authoritative parenting is the most common and most effective style (Steinberg et al., 1994; Petit, Bates, & Dodge, 1997). However, there is reason to believe that parenting, like many psychological concepts, is strongly influenced by cultural, temporal, and secular factors, suggesting the need for exploration of the role of family and parents in a wider range of cultures. Recent research has demonstrated that although some features of parenting seem to be universal (Barber et al, 2005), many questions about the cultural features of parenting remain. Research has shown that ethnic and cultural groups within the United States exhibit variations of parenting styles in a variety of contexts (Jarrett, 1998; Lau, Lew, Hau, Cheung, & Berndt, 1990; McLoyd, 2002; McWayne 2008; Chao, 1994; Steinberg et al., 1992). While ethnic groups are not homogeneous, members may share behavior patterns, popular cultural interests, communication preferences, and values that influence parenting practices (McLoyd, 2004). In particular, three decades of research on African Americans’ parenting has demonstrated that the predominate parenting style for this group includes greater restrictiveness, greater use of physical punishment, and greater levels of expressed warmth than studies of Caucasian American parents, and several researchers have examined the cultural and socioeconomic correlates of these group differences (Pittman & Chase-Lansdale, 2001). Cross-national studies of parenting support the idea that many cultures outside of North American and Western Europe employ variants of authoritarian
parenting (Keller, Lohaus, Kuensmueller, Abels, Yovsi, Voelker, et al., 2004). Anecdotal evidence and some preliminary research suggests that parents in West African cultures tend to employ stricter parenting techniques than Euro-American cultures (Ocansey, 2004), but there is a dearth of research about specific parenting preferences in various African cultures.

In summary, the parenting practices in urban Ghana is fairly unexplored by the social sciences, and the extent to which Ghanaian parents share features with Baumrind’s parenting styles or with culturally specific parenting styles of various ethnic groups is unknown. It is likely that Ghanaian parents will demonstrate some features in common with African American parents, given their common historical background, but these two groups are culturally distinct and may show important differences as well as similarities. The next section will describe how these questions will be explored, through the paradigm of intercultural research.

**Introduction to Intercultural Research**

Knowledge of cultural differences in parenting is an important component of intercultural competence in psychology, valuable for ethical and pragmatic reasons (Sue, 1991). Intercultural psychologists claim that Euro-American psychology, particularly in the United States, is to varying degrees insulated from the idea that the cultural environment is a pervasive influence on parenting (Jahoda, 1988, 1999; Bennet Veroff & Rule Goldberger, 1995). If culture has a strong influence on parenting, then parenting constructs that are identified in Euro-American families might not generalize to other
groups. Therefore, there is reason to explore whether Baumrind’s parenting typologies apply to Ghanaian parents, or if these terms are insufficient to describe parenting practices in urban Ghana. Before further discussing the questions of parenting in non-dominant United States ethnic groups or in countries outside of Europe and North America, it is useful to clarify the intent and nature of intercultural research.

From Cross-Cultural Psychology to an Intercultural Psychology Paradigm

The bounds of cultures are difficult to delineate. Each individual belongs to several cultural groups, which overlap, collide, and co-mingle. For example, a person’s unique cultural identity can be defined in varying strengths by gender, nationality, ethnicity, race, religion, and the combination of these “social locations” (Brown, 2008). How, then, can culture be assessed in psychological research? The following paragraphs highlight developments in the field of intercultural psychology, from its beginnings as a movement to compare cultures to its present form of exploring nuanced cultural influences on psychological processes.

Cross-cultural psychology began as an attempt to determine if cognitive psychological theories, based on Euro-American findings regarding memory, learning, spatial processing, and response time, applied to people in or from non-Euro-American cultures. The stated objective of cross-cultural psychology was to transport and test Euro-American theories to other contexts (1999). However, the transport-and-test theory of cross-cultural psychology demonstrated several shortcomings in execution. First, textbooks made little reference to cultural variations of psychological principles,
implying that Euro-American principles are universal (Jahoda, 1981). While this has shifted somewhat over the past few decades, cultural variations on psychological principles are often regarded as deviations from the norm (Jahoda, 1999; Bennet-Veroff, Rule-Goldberger, 1995). Second, it is extremely rare for authors trained in Euro-American psychology to revise current theories based on conflicting evidence from another culture. Rather, it is more common that the Euro-American, or default, psychological process is not applicable within the ‘special’ circumstances of the culture in question (Jahoda, 1999). In other words, transport-and-test research often highlights the differences of other cultures from Euro-American culture. Often, these differences are viewed as deficits according to Euro-American standards (Ardila & Keating, 2007). However, areas in which Euro-Americans tended to score lower than other groups, such as kinetic intelligence, balance, patience, and mechanical spatial processing, have often been downplayed as less important areas of ability or achievement (2007).

In sum, early psychological theories and research were largely developed by Euro-American academics. Despite their principles of objectivity, and the search for universal properties, all research inherently includes subjective components through the selective attention given to different topics, emphasis on certain skills or behaviors, and pursuit of measurement of human qualities that are of value to one’s reference groups. For instance, standard intelligence tests do not include a measure of kinetic intelligence (Ardila & Keating, 2007); yet in Ghanaian cultures (and many others), the concept of balance is considered the first human sense, with the five perceptive senses (sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch) relegated to secondary importance (Guerts, 2002). Infants are
taught to balance sitting on their mothers’ knees and lying patiently on mother’s backs as backtying cloths are adjusted. Soon after a baby can walk, parents and older siblings encourage this child to balance a small cup on top of his or her head, then take steps with it, and gradually increase to larger vessels for head-loading. As the child matures, the concept of balance is applied to emotional, cognitive, and social experiences (2002). As of this writing, no major measure of intelligence used in Euro-American intellectual ability testing addresses kinetic abilities.

A European and North American slant holds true for psychopathology as well. The definitions of mental disorders are a matter of ongoing contention (Hyman, 2010; Wholley, 2011). Currently, mental illnesses are diagnosed by criteria that are considered outside the realm of normal behavior or emotional processes, as defined mainly by Euro-American, upper class, educated professionals. However, diagnoses can be disproportionately applied. In a landmark study, Adebimpe (1981) found that the rate of diagnosis of schizophrenia was significantly higher in African American men than in European American men. However, epidemiological studies have consistently shown that the actual community prevalence of schizophrenia is fairly stable across ethnic, racial, and geographical groups (Kendler, Gallagher, Abelson, & Kessler, 1996). In contrast, Adebimpe (1981) found that European American men were more likely to carry diagnoses such as Bipolar Disorder, which is associated with less severe social stigma. The study concluded that the diagnosed differences were significantly greater than any possible epidemiological variability, as supported by worldwide prevalence studies of schizophrenia.
More recently, Mate-Kole (2007) found that a widely used measure of psychopathology symptoms, the Symptom Check List (SCL-90), has significant cultural bias with regards to African culture. In the study, European Americans in a community sample scored the lowest on the SCL-90, and their scores were consistent with the questionnaire’s published norms of a non-clinical sample. African Americans in a community sample scored somewhat higher than the European American group. A community sample of African-descended people in the Caribbean scored yet higher than the African American sample. Lastly, a Ghanaian community sample scored highest of all groups. Mate-Kole and colleagues concluded that their findings with the SCL-90 illustrated some bias towards culturally-bound psychopathological symptoms of Euro-Americans, because greater connection with African culture demonstrated high false positive rates of psychopathology in community samples. This study is a contemporary example of the way the transport-and-test approach is an incomplete method to describe the complexities of psychological processes across cultures. Greater consideration to within-group norms and constructs of mental processes is necessary to gain understanding of such processes (see also Eliacin, 2010).

The cross-cultural psychology approach attempts to overlay Euro-American concepts upon other groups, a heterogeneous multitude of non-Euro-American cultures. In contrast, intercultural psychology proposes a shift from an etic perspective, which promotes observations by an objective outsider, to an emic basis for learning, which attempts to understand a culture from within. In other words, intercultural psychology strives to move beyond the transport-and-test (Jahoda, 1999) approach toward a richer
view of transactions between and within societies (Jahoda, 199; Bennet Veroff & Rule Goldberger, 1995).

Contemporary Intercultural Psychology Research Paradigms

To execute the values of intercultural psychology, Veroff and Goldberger (1995) set forth three research paradigms for intercultural psychology: 1) Studying the impact of a given culture on the behaviors of individuals or groups, 2) Comparing and contrasting human behaviors/characteristics in different cultures, and 3) Studying how cultures interact in the greater social context. Intercultural psychology strives for awareness of the cultural context and within group differences that inevitably appear, as well as the transactional patterns of a culture with the greater societal context. This intercultural philosophy is the basis for the present study of parenting in urban Ghana. First, the study examines the impact of culture on parenting behaviors through examining the responses of urban Ghanaian parents to a qualitative, conversational interview, addressing a variety of parenting topics and shifts in popular belief over time. Second, the study compares survey responses of urban Ghanaians to existing research on Euro-American parenting styles, and how this data informs a model for a unique parenting style or styles in urban Ghana. Third, the qualitative interview explores how urban Ghanaian parents view the otherness of the American researcher as a communicator, for better or worse, to the academic realm in Euro-American culture.

To place this study of Ghanaian parenting in context, it is useful to review intercultural findings for several groups, which may have varying degrees of relationship
to Ghanaian parenting. In this way, the present study will go beyond a transport-and-test comparison of European heritage parenting to Ghanaian parenting, and instead examine Ghanaian parenting in the context of worldwide studies. In the next section, the intercultural research literature on parenting in a variety of cultures will be reviewed as a basis for studying parenting in Ghana.

**Intercultural Research on Parenting**

Existing research indicates that various features of culture impact the parenting of cultural minorities in the United States (Jarrett, 1998; Chao, 1994; Steinberg et al., 1992) and international populations (Payne & Furnam, 1992). Even within the United States, generational trends also demonstrate how cultural shifts alter the perceptions of parenting. Cultural context, including temporal, religious, ethnic, and political environment, influences social values and norms. In fact, Baumrind (1993) emphasized variance in responsiveness and demandingness, and that cultural norms determine relative high and low levels of these constructs.

Specifically, evidence from cross-national studies indicates that authoritarianism functions differently outside of European-heritage families in the United States (Chao, 1994; Payne & Furnam, 1992). Rudy & Grusec (2006) found that in collectivist cultures, children tend to see parental restrictiveness as normal; in contrast, in individualistic cultures strong parental control is generally perceived as hostile and rejecting. In their study, negative cognition towards children was associated with authoritarian parenting style only in individualistic cultures (2006). Likewise, Rao, McHale, & Pearson (2003)
demonstrated that authoritarian parenting practices encompass varying meanings across collective cultures. In a two part study of Indian and Chinese parents, both groups endorsed similar Authoritative and Authoritarian practices. However, in the Indian sample, authoritarianism was viewed positively, and was highly correlated with both filial piety and an emphasis on supporting a child’s social development; in contrast, supportive parenting practices and encouragement of a child’s social development were viewed by Chinese mothers as detrimental to academic achievement, and they placed greater emphasis on authoritarian practices and child training.

Another study, the Cross-National Adolescence Project (C-NAP), examined parenting practices in eight countries – Bangladesh, China, India, Bosnia, Germany, Palestine, Colombia, the United States, and South Africa – and found that parental acceptance predicted positive social and academic outcomes in adolescence, and parental psychological control predicted greater helplessness and depression across all groups, but that some aspects of parental control and leniency had qualitative differences across groups (Barber et al., 2003; Krishnakumar, 2004). Such findings are important because they de-pathologize alternative styles of parenting that do not conform to white, middle-class standards. Research in a variety of cultural groups supports the notion that cultural variation may be associated with differences in successful and predominate styles of parenting.

This finding sheds some light on the phenomenon that authoritarian parenting in Euro-American heritage groups tends to be conflated with “harsh parenting,” meaning low responsiveness, high demandingness, and negatively emotionally charged parental
discipline (Deater-Deckard, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1996). As previously stated, European American children who are raised by authoritarian parents tend to demonstrate poorer academic outcomes and less internalized moral values (Steinberg et al, 1996). However, these outcomes do not hold up for all cultural groups, when culture is defined by ethnicity (Deater-Deckard, & Dodge, 1997; McLoyd & Smith, 2002; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994), religious beliefs (Ellison, Bartosky, & Segal, 1996), geographical setting (Pinkerton & Scarr), or urban vs. rural locations (Blank, Thompson, Deater-Deckard, Fox, & Bond, 1996). Within the United States and beyond, non-European heritage, non-middle class, and non-urban cultural groups, among other cultural features, demonstrate a variety of different forms of parenting preferences.

Lessons From Research on African American Parenting

The literature on African American parenting is a prime example of cultural perspectives on child rearing practices. Two major foci of this research have been examining ethnic differences in parenting style of African American parents as compared to the parenting theories based on white or non-defined ethnicity samples, and exploring cultural bases for African American parenting as a unique psychological process that is not defined by comparisons to white samples. In effect, these two lines of research represent the etic (objective observations) and emic (insights from inside the process) perspectives of intercultural psychology. As such, the literature on African American parenting parallels the aims of the current study.
Etic Approach

Much of the earlier research on African American parenting styles, mainly in the 1970s to 1980s, focused on contrasting child rearing styles derived from studies of middle class white families to working class and urban African American families. Baumrind found that for white families, authoritative parenting produced assertive and autonomous children, but for African American children authoritarian parenting produced better results on child competency indicators (Baumrind, 1972). However, this type of comparative research relied on the assumption that parenting styles defined from white samples were cross-culturally valid, which is not necessarily the case (Hill, 1995). Also, many early studies examined the impact of some type of risk factor in the African American sample, rather than normal African American family processes (Anderson, 1989; Schoen & Kluegel, 1988).

Emic Approach

In the 1990s forward, an increasing literature on culturally-based family processes has been produced by an increasingly diverse group of academic researchers. Many studies have reexamined the assumption that authoritative parenting is the most common style in Euro-American families, while authoritarian parenting is assumed to be common in African American families (Baumrind, 1972). Hill (1995) found that African American adolescents rated their parents as having roughly equal levels of authoritativenss, authoritarianism, and permissiveness. Furthermore, high correlations between authoritativenss and authoritarianism appeared to be correlated with better
outcome indicators in these adolescents (1995), suggesting that Baumrind’s distinctions do not fully characterize African American parents in general.

The Topic of Discipline

A particular focus of cross-cultural and intercultural parenting research has been the use of physical discipline and other forms of parental control. The research on physical discipline in European American and African American families illustrates the progression from an etic to emic approach. Several studies have proposed that harsh physical discipline is related to the development of aggressive behaviors in children (Baumrind, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). While the usefulness of corporal punishment is controversial, studies have shown consistently that if the physical punishment is abusive then children are at increased risk for aggressive behavior (Dodge, Petit, & Bates, 1990). Physical discipline is distinguished from physical abuse in that discipline does not cause serious physical injury (McLoyd & Smith, 2002). Physical discipline is defined as striking a child with an open hand, with insufficient force to cause physical injury, and it is normative in most cultures to varying degrees (Baumrind, 1997; McLoyd & Smith, 2002).

While research has demonstrated that physical discipline is related to higher externalizing behaviors in European American families, research shows this is not always the case in African American families (McLoyd, 2002). Deater-Deckard and Dodge (1997) found that parenting behaviors surrounding physical discipline accounted for much of the group differences in aggressive child outcomes. Elaborating on this work,
McLoyd and Smith (2002) found that physical discipline was moderated in European American, Latino/a, and African American families by maternal warmth, such that spanking behaviors in the context of expressed maternal caring was not related to increases in child aggression (see also Mason, Cauce, Gonzales, & Hiraga, 1996). At the group level, European American parents tend to display more angry emotion and erratic application of physical punishment than African Americans (Lansford, Chang, Dodge, Malone, Oburu, & Palmerus, 2005). Within groups, African American mothers who endorse spanking tend to use physical discipline in strategic, predictable situations, with expressed warmth or caring feelings tend to produce children with lower levels of externalizing and internalizing problems. However, the same study found that African American mothers who do not endorse spanking, but resort to physical discipline when they are particularly frustrated, angry, or overwhelmed have children who demonstrate greater difficulties overall (McLoyd, Kaplan, Hardaway, & Wood, 2007; Smith & Brooks-Gunn, 1997). In essence, African American parents who utilize physical discipline with warmth and explanations demonstrate a hybrid of authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles, and produce children with better behavioral and emotional outcomes than parents who use physical punishment erratically and with expressed anger (Lansford, et al., 2005; McLoyd et al., 2007). The latter style exemplifies the authoritarian typology of high parental control with low emotional responsiveness; thus, intercultural research demonstrates that although physical discipline and high demands on children’s behavior is often associated with authoritarianism in European American families, a African American parents may effectively engage physical discipline in
combination with features of authoritarianism and authoritativeness with positive child outcomes.

Thus, the research on African American parenting, among other ethnic groups in the United States, is instructive to the current study in that it demonstrates ways in which cross-group comparisons are informative, but also that categories derived from one cultural group are not fully applicable to another. In particular, features of African American culture may have specific areas of commonality with Ghanaian cultures. Therefore, it is useful to attend to African American parenting styles, as well as maintain awareness that cultural differences between and within these groups also influence parenting norms. In the next section, basic information on Ghana and Ghanaian family life will be reviewed to explore possibilities of parenting patterns unique to Ghana.

**Background on Ghana**

Ghana is a nation located in West Africa, covering an area of 92,100 square miles (about the size of Colorado) along the Atlantic Ocean shore, and intersecting with the Greenwich 0° latitude line in the city of Tema, seventeen miles west of the capital Accra (See map of Ghana in Figure 2). Ghana was a British colony from 1874 until 1957, known then as the Gold Coast. Under the leadership of Kwame Nkrumah, Ghana attained independence in 1957 (Gocking, 2005). In the decades hence, Ghana’s political economy has endured several upheavals, although her people have been spared the trauma of civil war that has ravaged many other African nations (Osei, 1999). Currently, Ghana’s population of 23 million people is ruled by elected leaders, with her second
consecutive democratically president succeeding his predecessor peacefully (World Bank, 2011).

The population is composed of more than one hundred diverse ethnic groups (World Resources Institute, 2006; Adlakha, 1996). Many of these peoples can be classified under eight major groupings, although they are by no means homogeneous. These are: Ashanti / Akan, Adangbe, Akwamu, Dagomba, Ewe, Frafra, Ga, Guan (Dzokoto & Okazaki, 2006; Gocking, 2005). British influence upon the culture and educational system is imprinted on the face of present day Ghana. For example, English remains an official language, along with several indigenous languages. In rural areas, some individuals speak indigenous languages exclusively, such as Akwapim-Twi, Asante-Twi, Dagbani, Dangbe, Ewe, Fante, Ga, Kasem, and Nzema. Literacy rates in Ghana are high compared to other nations in the region, with approximately 80% of men and 60% of women able to read and write (World Resources Institute, 2006; Gyimah, 2006).
Figure 2: Political Map of Ghana
Urban Life

Urban areas in Ghana tend to ethnically diverse, including segregated and mixed ethnic neighborhoods. Accra, the nation’s capital, lies in a traditionally Ga region, but exhibits influences from residents drawn from many ethnic groups native to Ghana, in particular the Akan, and ethnic groups from other African nations who immigrate to Ghana for economic and political opportunities. Ethnic groups residing in the south have had more intensive historical exposures to colonial influences, such as Christianity, Euro-American education, and a money economy than northern regions, which display greater Islamic influence. These ethnic groups also tend to differ in language, traditions, and beliefs about kinship and childbirth. Religion plays an important role in daily life. Ghanaians spend substantial time attending religious functions, open various non-religious meetings with prayers, and religious devotions are evident in the names of businesses (Gmiyah, 2006; Dzokoto & Okazaki, 2006; Owusu-Ansah & McFarland, 1995).

While Ghana is comprised of heterogeneous groups, national identity is stronger than in most other African nations for several reasons. During the British colonization, imperial forces eventually yielded to pragmatism and integrated tribal chiefs into formal government, preserving respect among the people for traditional structures, and uniting tribal forces in the common cause of asserting their dominance within the confines of colonization (Gocking, 2005). In the years surrounding independence, Nkrumah and other leaders advocated not only for a united Ghana, but also for the liberation of all the colonized nations of Africa under a collaborative movement (Osei, 1999; Owusu-Ansah
& McFarland, 1995). Policies implemented by the Ghanaian government after independence also have contributed to feelings of national allegiance in harmony with respect for tribal heritage. For one example, the boarding school program initiated by Nkrumah for secondary education effectively transfers students from their home regions to various locations across the nation, socializing young persons of diverse backgrounds together. Additionally, Ghana does not contain two dominant ethnic groups pitted against one another for national power, as in other warring nations (Sakyi-Addo, 2006). Ghanaians participate in a unified government and the population pledges their allegiance to one nation, the “Black Star of Africa” (Dzokoto & Okazaki, 2006; Owusu-Ansah & McFarland, 1995).

Research in recent decades has demonstrated tremendous economic and political development in Ghana. Currently, 75% of the population still resides in rural areas, where the main occupation is farming (GhanaWeb, 2011). However, cities are rapidly growing, and Ghana is a major African trade partner with European and North American nations. The impact of globalization and technology on Ghanaian life is evident in business, as well as family practices (Van der Geest, 2004). In particular, cellular phone and mobile internet usage has made a strong impact, with growth from 700,000 subscribers in 2003 (GhanaWeb, 2011) to more than 7 million in 2008 (Farrar, 2008). The impact of technology on family life is largely unexplored.
Family Life in Ghana

Some features of families common in Ghana differ from concepts in the Euro-American world. Ghanaian families from many ethnic backgrounds tend to be composed of matriarchal structures. Matriarchy is more widespread in Akan groups than in less matrilineal groups, like Ga-Adangbe and Mole-Dagbani (Gmiyah, 2005; 2006). These group differences are often more pronounced in older cohorts than in the younger generation (Gmiyah, 2005). The responsibilities of child-rearing and managing the household, including earning income, often fall to the mothers. Marriage is often initiated and ended by the woman, and if the man cannot afford to house the wife and children, she remains with her family of origin. When a father is fiscally unstable, his relationship with his children is vague. He may act as a disciplinary accessory to the mother’s will, but he has little authority alone. Financial resources often remain separate, with more importance attached to consanguinal family ties than to marital partnerships. If a woman is unsatisfied financially, emotionally, or sexually, she might break the bond of marriage and return with her children to her family of origin (van der Geest, 2004). Research on parenting styles in Ghana is sparse, but preliminary studies demonstrate that adolescents tend to view their parents as authoritarian in approach (Ocansey, 2004).

Researching Urban Ghanaian Parenting Styles

Quantitative Approach

One way to examine cultural differences is through comparisons on surveys like the Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR; Block, 1965). This approach already has
been taken by several researchers, but not yet in West Africa. The current study is the first of its kind to assess parenting styles in Ghana with a widely used psychological survey, the CRPR. Quantitative data is useful for identifying which specific parenting practices are endorsed by parents in the current sample, and to what extent they agree with various parenting practices. The CRPR format in this study utilizes a Likert scale to assess the quality and strength of parenting practices in urban Ghanaian parents. Statistical analysis can identify patterns of correlated responses, as well as define distinct parenting typologies.

Published studies across cultures have used this method to derive patterns of parenting practices in India, China, and the United States. Exploratory factor analyses in these populations have identified distinct parenting styles that are related to features of each culture (Rao et al., 2003; Rickel & Biasetti, 1982). Some aspects of these parenting patterns are similar across groups, and other features differ. The current study first attempted a cross-cultural transport-and-test analysis, to determine if any of the existing factors on the CRPR, based on parenting typologies derived from studies across cultures, match the statistical patterns of responses for the urban Ghanaian sample of parents on the CRPR. While the transport-and-test process is inadequate to fully understand culture-specific psychological processes, it is also important to evaluate common features across groups. Next, the CRPR data from the Ghanaian sample were be examined to identify specific patterns of parenting practices, to see if one or more culturally distinct parenting styles emerges.
Qualitative Approach

In studies that compare survey data across cultures, it is common to find differences among the groups and one way to understand these differences is to incorporate qualitative data (Crabtree, Yanoshik, Miller, & O’Connor, 1993). In-depth interviews are an effective method for understanding survey findings in a new population. The current study uses quantitative survey methods to compare to published research on parenting approaches, as well as qualitative interviews to gain deeper understanding of the cultural variation on parenting in Ghana.

There is an ongoing debate regarding whether individual interviews or focus groups are the better method for obtaining qualitative information. Social science research in Ghana has been successfully conducted on a variety of topics through both methods (Tindana, Kass, & Akweongo, 2006; van der Geest, 1976). Advantages of focus groups include sampling the consensus statements of different types of people, collecting information in a social situation through which participants might build upon one another’s ideas, and avoiding the redundancy of individual interviews (Crabtree et al., 1993). The focus group also has specific advantages for research in Ghana because this method of obtaining detailed information reflects collectivistic decision making in the daily lives of Ghanaians, involving interchange and open debate among individuals. Particularly in rural areas, people often congregate in communal living areas resembling the conversational gatherings of focus groups (Dzokoto & Okazaki, 2006).

However, certain advantages of in-depth individual interviews should also be considered when selecting a method for qualitative data collection. In some cases, it is
possible that the group process inhibits some participants from revealing information that may be deemed socially undesirable by the group (Dzokoto & Okazaki, 2006). The sociocentric nature of Ghanaian culture may put individuals at particularly high risk for suppression of undesirable beliefs in the presence of others.

One common misconception about individual interviews is that it is more difficult to obtain a large sample size from interviews than from focus groups. On the contrary, the unit of analysis for the focus group is not the number of participants, but rather the number of groups that are held. Hence, a research study could hold ten focus groups of several people, or the researchers could interview 10 individuals, and the sample size would be the same. Individual responses in a focus group can be examined, but the data are collected from the group as one unit (Crabtree et al., 1993). The number of interview participants will be determined by confirmation of data saturation, the point at which no new themes are emerging from the interviews. In other words, as interviews are collected, the researcher will evaluate them for thematic content. After a certain point, all of the major ideas about parenting will have been stated. More interviews are redundant after data saturation is reached (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). There is no way to predict exactly how many interviews will be required; however, usually this number is below fifty.

One should consider the research questions of a particular study when deciding which method to use. In the current study, the goal is that quantitative surveys of parenting styles will be confirmed by rich qualitative data. Such information could conceivably be obtained through group or individual methods. However, subtle
differences guide the selection of the appropriate method. Groups are more effective at eliciting information on a broad range of topics (Crabtree et al., 1993). For example, if the goal of the current study was to assess parenting styles, use of discipline, perceptions of child abuse, and parent involvement in the schools, a focus group format would be more suitable because participants each give shorter, public answers.

In-depth individual interviews tend to be preferred for gathering greater depth of information, such as personal examples, stories, and long explanations (Crabtree et al., 1993). The in-depth interview method is best suited to the research question in the current study, which seeks to understand the intricacies of Ghanaian parenting style. The pairing of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods is ideal for acquiring a comprehensive picture of parenting in Ghana (see Fuller, Edwards, Vorakitphokatorn, & Sermsri, 1993).

**Hypotheses**

The present study sought to identify the constructs of parenting practices within an urban Ghanaian population. Self-reported parenting practices were measured on the Block Child-Rearing Practices Report (CRPR) and compared to published studies of parenting constructs in India, China, and the United States. Ghanaian parenting practices and attitudes were also measured through qualitative interviews. Subgroup differences based on ethnicity, social class, and family structure were be assessed to determine how these factors affect results. The current study made several predictions about parenting in Ghana as reported on the CRPR and interviews. Given information based on
ethnographic studies and psychological research based on culturally related groups, several hypotheses were proposed. These hypotheses are summarized in Table 1, and explained in detail in the following paragraphs.

Hypothesis One

It was hypothesized that Baumrind’s style of parenting as demonstrated on the CPRR will not be confirmed, but that a unique factor structure will emerge that characterized the predominant parenting style of Ghana parents. Data from the CRPR self-report questionnaire was analyzed with respect to previously published models of parenting styles from this questionnaire in India, China, and the United States. Urban Ghanaian parents were likely to demonstrate more similarities to factors found in the Indian and Chinese sample (Rao et al., 2003), because these cultures and Ghanaian cultures tend to endorse similar collectivist values (Lo & Dzokoto, 2005; Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995); therefore, the current data were tested with this model first using structural equation modeling. The CRPR items included in the Indian and Chinese parenting factors of Authoritativeness and Authoritarianism are listed in Appendix B.

If the fit of the Ghanaian data to the Rao et al. (2003) model was poor, then it was proposed that the data might better fit a model from a United States sample (Rickel & Biasetti, 1982). The CRPR items included in the United States parenting factors of Responsiveness and Restrictiveness are listed in Appendix C. If the Ghanaian data had
poor fit with both of these models, then individual factor loadings would be examined to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the models for the current sample.

Table 1. Study Hypotheses

| Hypothesis 1: | $H_1$: Ghanaian data will fit the CRPR structure derived from Chinese & Indian sample (Rao et al., 2005). Factors: |
| | • Authoritarian Practices |
| | • Authoritative Practices |
| $H_2$: | Ghanaian data will fit the CRPR structure derived from American sample (Rickel & Biasetti, 1982). Factors: |
| | • Restrictiveness |
| | • Nurturance |
| $H_0$: | Ghanaian data will not fit either of the previously published factor structures |
| $H_a$: | A new latent factor structure will be explored for the Ghanaian CRPR data |

| Hypothesis 2: | $H_a$: Exploratory analyses of questions 1-3 on the qualitative parent interviews will examine definitions of parenting, influences of religion/faith, and disciplinary practices |

| Hypothesis 3: | $H_1$: Majority of parents will identify generational differences between the way they parent and the way they were parented. |
| | • If null cannot be rejected: quality of generational differences will be explored |
| $H_0$: | Parents will not identify generational differences |

| Hypothesis 4: | $H_a$: Exploratory analyses of question 5 on the qualitative parent interview will examine ideas about intercultural research, especially by American or European researchers coming to Ghana. |

Next, if the data did not fit either existing model, then it was proposed that an exploratory model, derived from the Ghanaian parents’ CRPR responses, would best describe parenting practices in urban Ghana. Because Ghana tends to be a sociocentric,
collectivist culture (Lo & Dzokoto, 2006), it was expected that Ghanaian parents will report high levels of restrictiveness, representing features of authoritarian behavioral and psychological control, and another strong feature of warmth or emotional support that is distinct from the nurturance factor on the CRPR. Additionally, it was predicted that demographic characteristics would be associated with certain parenting practices, such that parents in southern urban Ghana would endorse greater responsiveness and parents in the north would endorse greater restriction on children’s behaviors.

Hypothesis Two

It was predicted that qualitative data from parent interviews would support culturally distinct parenting constructs in the Ghanaian sample. Specifically, it was hypothesized that interview responses would illustrate features of high restrictiveness accompanied by high levels of support from parents towards children. Interview questions were examined for features related to expressing warmth, controlling child behavior, and engaging religious beliefs in parenting behaviors. These themes were then compared to the CRPR factors endorsed by each interview respondent.

Hypothesis Three

It was predicted that urban Ghanaian parents would report in the qualitative interviews that they view parenting and treat their children differently than their own parents generation, and their responses to inquiry about managing these generational differences was explored. Although little information is available about the tactics
parents use to bridge the generation gap between themselves and their children, given political, economic, and educational changes that have occurred in the last several decades, as well as increased Euro-American influences through technology, it was expected that Ghanaian parents would endorse some departures from the parenting patterns their own parents used.

Hypothesis Four

As the primary investigator does not claim Ghanaian heritage, it was proposed that the researcher’s culture had some impact on the content. Therefore, qualitative interviews elicited participants’ views of the researcher, and of intercultural researchers in general, for the purpose of learning about potential pitfalls in this study and avoiding intercultural transgressions in the future. Participants were asked to provide any advice, comments, or criticisms to the researchers about conducting research on family processes in Ghana, including comments on the questionnaire, methods, or other features. It was hypothesized that participants would express preferences for having Ghanaian researchers present (Dzokoto & Okazaki, 2006), or otherwise including Ghanaian perspectives in the design and interpretation of the research. However, due to the culture of the primary investigator, and the nature of this research, specific a priori hypotheses for this interview question were not appropriate. Exploration of participants’ responses, including coding of themes by Ghanaian research associates, was planned to condense their answers and understand the advice and opinions given.
CHAPTER III:

METHOD

Sample

Participants

Participants were 322 parents recruited primarily from the capital city of Accra and near suburbs in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana, as well as from the northern city of Tamale. Two hundred and ninety six parents completed the survey portion of the study, and thirty of these participated in the audio-recorded interview. Only one parent per household was permitted to participate in the study, in order to maintain statistical independence of participants. Parents were invited to participate in the paper and pencil questionnaire portion of the study if they were above the age of 16, and had at least one child between the ages of 5 and 12 years old. In addition, every third participant was invited to participate in an audio-recorded interview.

Recruitment

Participants were recruited through several contact points in communities. The primary investigator and community liaisons (undergraduate and graduate students from The University of Ghana, and two school parents) visited basic schools (1-6 grade), places of worship, and community gathering areas such as the center clearing in a neighborhood, markets, and community leaders’ homes. For places of worship, mosques
and churches were included, but no traditional animist shrines were included due to the nature and frequency of worship gatherings. The recruitment method used a snowball approach, which engaged liaisons and community members to create contacts with more community members.

Random sampling was not preferred for this study due to difficulties in collecting a truly random sample, and the potential for wariness engendered by the primary investigator’s outsider status. First, random sampling in a cities like Accra and Tamale cannot rely on well-established Euro-American methods of telephone or postal recruitment: landline phones are rare and most people use unlisted cellular phone numbers. Postal mail delivery of questionnaires would be strongly skewed towards the middle class and would likely have a low return rate due to the impersonal nature of this type of recruitment (Akotia, 2007).

Methods of community based recruitment, rather than random sampling, were preferable for this study. Research has documented that individuals who perceive difference between themselves and a researcher, especially with a negative power differential, often view research studies with trepidation (Jarrett, 1993). Participants may perceive research procedures as impersonal or threatening due to the historical and current power differentials between the researcher and themselves (Jarrett), and the perceptions of these power differentials in the current study was likely to vary considerably within the sample population. In Ghana, researchers have reported that participants expressed cautiousness towards both Ghanaian and foreign researchers (Dzokoto & Okazaki, 2006), further highlighting the need for sensitivity in recruitment.
Several sources have indicated that building a trustworthy connection with community leaders within educational and religious institutions and local ethnic group leaders creates an environment in which individuals feel more comfortable with participating in research (Dzokoto & Okazaki; Tindana et al., 2006).

As the first step towards recruitment, the primary investigator established contacts at the University of Ghana among faculty and students. Psychology faculty members communicated willingness to advise the primary investigator and recommend graduate students and community liaisons to assist with the project. These liaisons identified potential recruitment sites, and used their existing networks to access educational, religious, or ethnic community leaders, and to use their personal networks to access more community leaders. Once contacts were established, liaisons went alone or with the primary investigator to meet community leaders and introduce the research project. Community leaders were provided with written information on the project and researchers, and engaged in conversation to ensure comprehension and comfort with the project. At the end of this visit, the leaders were asked if they were willing for the researcher and liaisons to invite their community to participate. They were offered time to consider the idea or discuss with others, if needed (see Tindana et al., 2006).

With the permission of the community leader, the primary investigator and liaisons made public announcements for participant volunteers to fill out questionnaires on parenting. The settings for these calls for participants included religious services which the investigator and liaisons attended, afterschool meetings of parents, or in a public gathering place in a neighborhood. Parents who agreed to participate were invited
to participate that day, and many preferred to take the survey home and bring it back in about a week, when the research team would return for a follow-up visit. Of those completing the questionnaire, every third participant was offered to participate in a brief interview about parenting practices.

Informed Consent

A recent study of the informed consent process for biomedical research in northern Ghana demonstrated inconsistent comprehension and memory among participants for aspects of the consent process and voluntary participation, in part because many participants were unfamiliar with scientific research practices (Oduro, Aborigo, Amugsi, Anto, Anyorigiya, Atuguba, et al., 2008). The ethical considerations of consent for voluntary research are heightened in the case of intercultural research, particularly when one or more of the researchers hails from a more socio-politically dominant position than some of the potential participants, based on nationality, income, education, ethnicity, race, gender, or religion. In such cases, one or more power differentials may exist between the researcher and potential participants. The potential for such power differentials can be foreseen in many intercultural research studies, and therefore special considerations should be applied in obtaining informed consent. No firm guidelines exist for consent in intercultural research situations, in part due to the difficulty in navigating international differences in ethical standards and practices (Fisher, 2004). Within the United States, the federal government requires special considerations for obtaining informed consent from certain “vulnerable populations” (Office for Human Research
This status does not apply to intercultural research samples (in which the researcher is from a culture other than the population of study). However, it is useful to consider that the spirit behind the “vulnerable populations” stipulation is to protect persons who might otherwise feel coerced to participate in research. Intercultural research requires awareness of socio-political power differentials that may or may not impact the process of informed consent (Ashcroft, 2002; Benatar, 2002). In the current study, the primary investigator was a white, female, English-speaking doctoral student from the United States. The liaisons were Ghanaian university students and community members, and usually had greater education levels, income, and resources than the many (but not all) of the population of available research participants. In contemplating these power differentials, several issues arise regarding consent for social science research in intercultural designs, whether in the researcher’s home country or in a foreign nation.

Informed consent is recognized as an essential component of research protocols. It is one of the major procedures for respecting the rights of research participants, communicating the intent of the researcher, and abiding by enforceable ethical codes of conduct in various scientific fields. Growing recognition of the constraints on the procedures of informed consent held as standards in developed countries has led to reconsiderations of the purpose and format of consent in culturally and sociopolitically diverse populations. In high-level political economies, such as the United States, Canada, Japan, and Western Europe, informed consent relies on several assumptions: beneficence, justice, and respect for autonomy. The Belmont Report (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Protections: OHRP, 2011).
Research, 1979) proposed that these features are universally applicable to human subjects. The report defines beneficence as the responsibility of the researcher to avoid harm and maximize gains for the participant, justice as the distribution of harms and benefits among participant populations, and respect for autonomy as an individual’s to evaluate the research and make an independent decision to participate or not. However, researchers working in developing countries are reporting that while the Belmont Report’s principles may be theoretically universal, their application is not equal in all settings (DuBois, 2004). In general, researchers can anticipate most ethical dilemmas related to beneficence and justice in the research design phase. Respect for autonomy is problematic when a power differential between researchers from developed nations interact with relatively less empowered participants, creating an ethical concern of coercion or inducement (Benatar, 2002; Dawson & Kass, 2005). If the principles of ethical research in the Belmont Report are universal, researchers must gain awareness of how their application is prone to shift across cultures.

**Autonomy vs. Interdependence**

Dawson and Kass (2005) examined data from American researchers conducting studies in developing countries through focus groups and questionnaires to obtain their perspectives on several dilemmas related to the application of informed consent procedures. The researchers identified a number of problems, one of the most popular being differences in the cultural understandings of autonomy. For example, in parts of Sub-Saharan Africa, individuals may not feel comfortable making a decision independent
of others regarding his or her participation in research (Dawson & Kass; Hipshmann, 1999; Hyder & Wali, 2006; Monshi & Zieglmayer, 2004). Communities that emphasize collectivism may not view participation as an individual choice. As one focus group participant in Dawson and Kass’ (2005) study stated:

I surely can’t speak for [other countries], but in [African country] and in other areas of sub-Saharan areas of Africa where I’ve worked, this is a communal process, and the last one who is involved is the family, the parent, and by the time you’ve gone through the chief and the elders and the village, the process is already well in motion… (Dawson & Kass, 2005, p. 1215)

This opinion highlights the notion that individuals in interconnected communities may feel inclined to discuss research participation with family, community members, and community leaders (See also Benatar, 2002). Previous research has shown that approval by community leaders, religious leaders, ethnic group leaders, or household heads is useful and sometimes necessary in Ghana (Tindana et al., 2006). The current study has the added complexity of an urban setting, where the collision of the many ethnic groups found in Ghanaian cities as well as foreign influences may have a significant impact on individualism and autonomy. Researchers cannot expect potential participants to contemplate their place on a continuum of autonomy and interconnectedness before consenting to participate in research; rather, the burden is on the researcher to establish trust with communities and individuals, and to provide opportunities for communal and individual decisions regarding informed consent.

In the current study, recruitment strategies described earlier demonstrate the strategy used to obtain the assent community leaders before seeking individual
participants in any group. Community leaders were advised to inform their groups that they had approved of the study, but that no one was required to participate. Once potential participants were identified, the study was introduced, and written and verbal consent were sought. Individuals were encouraged to consult with family or leaders if they wished.

**Consent format**

The World Health Organization’s Ethics Review Committee Guidelines indicate that voluntary written consent should be obtained, with a preference for written format when available (WHO, 2007). Written consent forms pose problems on several levels for intercultural researchers and their participants. In many studies, literacy among participants can be an obstacle to negotiating informed consent. Among those who can read, the complex language required by many institutions renders consent forms unrelatable or unintelligible. Researchers in Dawson & Kass’ (2005) focus groups expressed that such forms damaged the relationship between the study team and the population, or that participants viewed it as a legal document intended to protect the researchers’ liability rather than the participants’ rights. Alternatively, other researchers have found that members of certain populations with very low rates of English literacy found the consent documents assuring (Tindana, Kass, Akweongo, 2006). Although they could not sign, some participants marked the form with a thumb ink print. Most participants in this study kept the forms as important records, or as a ‘ticket’ entitling
them to future research benefits. Many stated that even though they could not read, they
could have someone read it to them.

This literature suggests that a combination of written and oral consent may best
serve participants in intercultural research situations. In addition, participants who may
not read well or read the language of the research study proficiently might be inclined to
withhold their incomprehension from the researcher to avoid appearing impolite (Akotia,
2007). Therefore, this study followed the protocol of providing written consent forms
with verbal explanations as a matter of course for all participants.

**Consent to complete the questionnaire**

For parents interested in completing the questionnaire only, informed consent was
sought using verbal and written means. Consent was explained as a voluntary agreement
that the parent was free to choose to participate. In addition, it was explained that no
participant was required to fill the questionnaire, and there would be no consequences
from the researcher or community leaders for declining. Participants were informed that
the questionnaire was an anonymous survey about parenting practices. Participants were
instructed not to write their name on any of the forms. They were informed that if they
agreed to participate in the questionnaire, they could stop at any time or skip a question if
the topic made them feel uncomfortable, and there would be no penalty. The researcher
and liaisons assured potential participants that all who engaged in the research would
receive a token of thanks (a pen, pencil, or keychain), even if they didn’t complete the
entire questionnaire. The written consent form was presented as an agreement from the
researcher to the participants that participation was voluntary, that there was no penalty for stopping the questionnaire or skipping items that they didn’t wish to answer, and that their responses would be kept anonymous. In the verbal exchange to explain informed consent to potential participants, if an individual expressed verbal or non-verbal signs of discomfort, then the researcher and liaisons offered this person to wait until the following week, and discuss it with family or other associates. Participants were provided with the researcher’s local phone number, and informed that they could call the researcher if they had any questions or concerns before or after participating. Additionally, they were provided with an email for a professor at the researcher’s home university to contact with complaints or questions. Also, they could contact the professor of psychology at the University of Ghana who was overseeing the researcher.

**Consent to the qualitative parent interview**

Approximately every third participant who completed the questionnaire portion of the research study was invited to participate in an audio-recorded interview about parenting. Previous research in Ghana has reported that some individuals may not agree to audio recording (Dzokoto & Okazaki 2006). Therefore, extra care was taken to explain the parameters of the recorded interview. Participants were informed that this interview would take about 10 to 20 minutes, that it was completely voluntary, and that their audio-recorded interview would be used for research purposes only and never played in a public setting. They were informed that declining this portion of the research study would not result in any penalty. They were also informed that their name would
not be used in the recordings, but their recording would be linked to their questionnaire data by an identification number already assigned to each questionnaire, and this number would never be linked to their name or used in any other way to identify them.

Once a participant expressed comprehension of the interview process, he or she was provided with another consent form for audio recording. Participants were given time to read this form and the researchers explained that it was an agreement from the researcher to the participant that the audio-recorded interview would proceed as it had been described, that it was anonymous, and that the recordings would only be used for research purposes. Again, participants were informed that they could call the researcher if they had any questions or concerns after they had already participated, and that they could email the researcher’s home university with complaints or questions, and that they could contact the professor of psychology at the University of Ghana who was overseeing the researcher.

Design

The goal of this study was to collect cross-sectional data on a sample of Ghanaian parents in sufficient qualitative richness and quantitative power to analyze parenting beliefs and attitudes. Participants completed the Child Rearing Practices Report (Block, 1965) and a demographic questionnaire. A segment of these participants also engaged in an audio-recorded interview to gain additional information that might explain and supplement the quantitative results.

Measures
Paper and pencil questionnaires were available in English and Twi, but all parents chose to take the questionnaire in English. Participants were not asked to state why they chose to complete the questionnaires in English, but it may be because English is the official language and Ghanaians are used to filling out forms in English rather than Twi. Also, while Twi is the most commonly spoken language in many parts of Ghana, approximately half of Ghanaians speak another indigenous language as their mother tongue, and speak Twi and/or English as second languages. Parents were offered to complete the questionnaires themselves if they wished, and researchers also offered to read the questions aloud to the participants if they preferred not to read. If participants requested that the researcher read questions aloud, then they were given the option of marking their own responses, or verbally telling the researcher which response they wished to select.

Child Rearing Practices Report

The Child Rearing Practices Report (CRPR; Block, 1965) is a 91 item parent survey (see Appendix A) reliably measures indices of authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles (Block, 1963; Chao, 1994, Dekovic, 1991) with mean test-retest reliability ranging from 0.64 – .707 (Block, 1981; Rickel, 1982). The CRPR has been examined in a variety of cultures and ethnicities around the world (Dekovic, 1991; Rudy & Grusec, 2006) and has been successfully translated into Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Finnish, Croatian, Cantonese, and Dutch (Block, 1965). The original CRPR was administered in Q-sort format; however, the psychometrics of the CRPR have also been
successfully tested in a 6-point Likert scale format (Rickel & Biasatti, 1982) with sufficient reliability and preservation of the factor structure. No published scale constructions of the CRPR are available, but multiple factor analyses of the CRPR are published in the literature (Dekovic, Janssens, & Gerris, 1991; Rudy & Grusec, 2006). A two-factor solution accounting for a reasonable proportion of variance is available for scales referred to as Nurturance and Restrictiveness (Rickel & Biasatti, 1982). This scale construction maps closely onto the theoretical concepts of Responsiveness and Restrictiveness in Baumrind’s parenting style theory (Baumrind, 1966, 1993; Barber et al., 2005). The current study tested the relevance of the Nurturance and Restrictiveness factors in a Ghanaian population, and additional factors were explored to determine if unique constructs of Ghanaian urban parenting could be identified.

Demographic Questionnaire

Parents who participated in the questionnaire portion of the study also completed a brief demographic questionnaire. This form included questions about the participant’s age, gender, level of education, occupation, number of children and their ages, and their age when their first child was born. Participants were also asked to answer these demographic questions about their spouse if they were married, and to identify who lived in their households. In addition, the demographic questionnaire included information on participants’ religion, ethnic group, and city of origin.

Qualitative Parenting Interview
Participants who were invited and accepted to be interviewed were asked to respond to several questions about their parenting practices, including overall impressions of parenting, discipline, problem-solving, generational differences, and the influence of faith. The format of these interviews was conversational, for the purpose of putting participants at ease and making research an enjoyable experience, rather than interrogatory. The researcher and liaisons asked questions in any order that felt natural to the dialogue. Interviewees were asked to give feedback to the researcher and liaisons regarding the process of studying parenting in Ghana. The question usually posed last requested participants to give constructive advice to future researchers, including problems to avoid. Through conversation during the interview, the qualitative parenting interview assessed the participant’s overall impressions of the questionnaires and their relevance.

**Planned Analyses**

Analysis of the results occurred in three steps. First, data from the demographic questionnaire was examined to determine patterns in the sample with respect to gender, ethnicity, religion, geographical location, and social class. Next, quantitative data from the CRPR survey was analyzed using structural equation modeling to determine the fit of this data to published CRPR models, and explore new models. Lastly, the qualitative parenting interviews were examined for themes in response to each question. Themes were checked for face validity with the data by Ghanaian graduate student liaisons.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Analysis of the results occurred in four steps. First, data from the demographic questionnaire were examined to describe participants’ gender, ethnicity, religion, geographical location, and social class. Next, quantitative data from the CRPR survey were analyzed using structural equation modeling to test the fit of this data to a new pattern of parenting constructs or to previous research. In the third step, several goals were attempted. First, responses to questions 1-3 of the qualitative parenting interviews were explored for themes that might shed light on constructs of parenting not fully assessed by the CRPR. Second, responses to question 4 on the qualitative parenting interviews were examined to explore how parents in this sample perceive generational changes in family life through retrospective comparison. Third, responses to question 5 were explored to assess participants’ experience of the researchers and research project, and to gather process observations about intercultural psychological research in general. In the fourth step of the project’s data analyses, factor scores from the CRPR factor structure which best fit this sample were crossed with the sample’s demographic features and the thematic content of the qualitative questionnaires.
Step One: Descriptive Results

Participant Characteristics

Out of the 339 participants, 329 finished completing the questionnaire portion of the study, and 322 of these completed a sufficient number of items to be included in the results (i.e. seven were excluded due to multiple skipped questions). Thirty of these survey participants also participated in the audio-recorded interview. Participants were parents of children between the ages of five and twelve years, living in the urban areas of Accra or Tamale, Ghana. Only one parent per household was permitted to participate in the study, in order to maintain the statistical independence of the data.

Demographic characteristics of the participants can be found in Tables 2 & 3, and are summarized in this section. Among the 322 usable parent surveys, 164 (50.9%) were male, and 150 (47.8%) were female, and 8 parents (2.5%) did not indicate their gender. The average age of parents in the study was 41 years (SD = 7.5 years). The mean number of children per household (including those outside the target age range of 5-12 years old) was 3.01, with a minimum of 1 child and a maximum of 13 children. The mean age of children in the household was 10.5 years, SD = 6.53.

Table 2. Family Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent age</td>
<td>40.98 years</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of parent at first child</td>
<td>27.46 years</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of children</td>
<td>10.55 years</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>42.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>3 children</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of marital status, 277 participants (86%) indicated that they were currently married, 20 were divorced (6.2%), 11 were widowed (3.4%), 3 had never married (0.9%), and data were missing for 11 parents (3.4%). When asked to identify the head of their household, 223 indicated it was the father (69.3%), 19 indicated the mother (5.9%), 10 indicated another male relative (3.1%), 6 indicated another female relative (1.9%), 3 indicated both parents (0.9%), 1 person indicated the landlord (0.3%), and 60 parents did not respond (18.6%).

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Accra / Southern Region</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamale / Northern Region</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td>Ashanti / Akan</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adangbe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akwamu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dagomba</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ewe</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frafra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ga</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remarried</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Leader</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other male relative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other female relative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic (elementary)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Secondary (junior high)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Secondary (senior high)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade / Vocational</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic (elementary)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior Secondary (junior high)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Secondary (senior high)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade / Vocational</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unskilled laborer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trader</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skilled worker</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulltime parent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Socioeconomic status was assessed through both parents’ educational achievements and occupation. Each parent was requested to provide this information for himself or herself, as well as his or her spouse if they were currently married. Overall, the sample was highly educated, with 116 of the mothers (36%) and 197 of the fathers (61.2%) having attended university. For the mothers, 55 attended trade or vocational school (17.1%), 47 completed secondary school (14.6%), 38 completed junior secondary school (11.8%), 22 completed basic elementary school (6.8%), and 6 reported no education (1.9%). For the fathers, 40 attended trade or vocational school (12.4%), 29 attended secondary school (9%), 12 attended junior secondary school (3.7%), 11 attended basic elementary school (3.4%), and no fathers were reported to have not attended any school. A total of 8 respondents did not answer the educational status questions, (2.5% for mothers or fathers). The majority of participants were employed in professional work (n=142, 44.1%), 76 were skilled workers (23.6%), 23 were market traders (7.1%), 6 were unskilled laborers (1.9%), 4 were students (1.4%), 3 were students (0.9%), 3 were unemployed (0.3%) and 65 did not report an occupation (20.2%).

Two hundred and thirty participants (71.4%) were recruited from the Accra metropolitan area in the south of Ghana, 81 lived in the city of Tamale (25.2%) in the Northern Region, and geographical data were not reported for 11 respondents (3.4%). With regards to ethnicity, 108 identified as Akan (33.5%), 67 were Dagomba (20.8%), 52 were Ewe (16.1%), 52 were Ga (16.1%), 4 were Guan (1.2%), 3 were Akwamu (0.9%), 1 was Adangbe (0.3%), and 23 did not report ethnicity (7.1%). Two hundred and fifty-five participants (81.2%) identified their faith as Christianity, including Catholic, protestant,
and evangelical denominations, while 59 participants (18.2%) identified Islam as their faith. Eight participants (2.5%) did not fill this question, and none of these urban participants identified as practicing traditional religions, also referred to as animist beliefs. Out of those who identified as Muslim, 49 (87.5%) lived in the northern city of Tamale. Out of those who identified as Christian, 216 (87.1%) lived in the Accra area in the south.

In sum, participants in this sample had higher educational achievement than the average educational level of Ghanaian adults. The sample included a somewhat different distribution of ethnic groups than the national or urban distribution, because the current sample included a somewhat lower percentage of Akan ethnic group members (33% vs. 45% in the nation; United States Central Intelligence Agency, 2011). Also, the religious distribution in this sample included slightly more Muslims, slightly fewer Christians, and fewer traditional religions than in Ghana, in which 16% identify as Muslim, 69% identify as Christian, and 9% practice traditional religions (2011).

Missing Data

Among the 322 usable CRPR questionnaires (Block, 1964), 260 participants marked a response to every item, while 72 participants left at least one item blank. On an item-by-item basis, there was less than 3% missing data. Analyses were conducted using Bonferroni corrections for multiple tests – \( t \)-tests for continuous variables and \( \chi^2 \)-square tests for categorical variables – to determine if missing data were associated with any demographic characteristics (gender, age, occupation, mother’s education, father’s
education, religion, regional location, ethnicity, and household leader). The only significant result (i.e., corrected alpha = 0.003) occurred for item 10, on which significantly more women than men were missing data than men (16 women and 4 men). This item was, “I wish my spouse were more interested in our children.” Out of the 20 participants who left this item blank, 4 were men and 16 were women. Two of the men were divorced, one was currently married, and one did not report marital status. Of the women, three were divorced, three were never married, one was widowed, and nine were currently married. It is possible that the seven women and one man who reported they were single may have left this item blank because they did not feel it applied to them, if the other parent was not involved with the children. A chi-square test of the participants who left Item 10 blank for the cross-tabulation of gender and marital status was not significant, and marital status alone cannot account for the differences in missing data by gender. Therefore, for all items except for CRPR item 10, missing data were replaced with an imputation of the mean score for that item. For item 10, mean imputation was conducted separately for each gender.

**Step Two: Quantitative Analyses of Parent Survey Data**

**Hypothesis One: Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

Hypothesis 1 proposed that data from the Ghanaian participants would fit a two-factor CRPR structure derived from a Chinese and Indian sample (Rao et al., 2003), given the common cultural values of collectivism and interdependence that these cultures share with Ghanaian culture. As an alternative, it was also proposed that the current data
would fit a CRPR model derived from an American sample (Rickel & Biasetti, 1982), which has been applied in dozens of cultural groups in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. The null hypothesis was that the data would not sufficiently fit either of these models, because the items comprising their respective scales would not carry the same meanings or cluster together in the same pattern in the Ghanaian data. If neither of these models sufficiently explained variance in the current sample (i.e., the results failed to reject the null hypothesis), then an exploratory hypothesis was proposed that a unique factor structure of Ghanaian parenting constructs would emerge.

The first step in testing Hypothesis 1 was to test the fit of the current data to the Authoritative and Authoritarian two-factor solution observed by Rao, McHale, & Pearson (2003) in a Chinese and an Indian sample using structural equation modeling (LISREL 8.8). The participants in these samples had many similar characteristics to the current sample (non-Euro-American, collectivist culture, urban, educated, mostly middle to upper class); therefore, it was proposed that this model would fit the current data better than models derived from American samples. Results of a confirmatory factor analysis converged after 31 iterations, $\chi^2 (206) = 423.73, p < 0.01$; RMSEA = 0.0594, $p < 0.05$; CFI = 0.823. Critical $N (195.039)$ was exceeded, but the chi-square degrees of freedom ratio indicated that sample size was not quite sufficient to test this model, $\chi^2/df = 2.056$, with 2.0 as the cut-off for an acceptable ratio.

Results of structural equation modeling do not necessarily yield definitive answers the same way as univariate significance statistics, because there are many methods to test how well the data fit a given model. It is considered best practice to
examine several different goodness of fit indices. The chi-square based methods of estimating goodness of fit demonstrated that the Ghanaian participants’ responses were significantly different from this two-factor solution. However, because chi-square is impacted by sample size, it was useful to check other fit indices that are not as susceptible to sample size bias. The Comparative Fit Index ranges from 0 to 1, with higher statistics indicating better fit. The CFI takes into account the ratio between chi-square and degrees of freedom (Brown, 2006), and in this model CFI demonstrated reasonably good fit, CFI = 0.823. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) also accounts for sample size and degrees of freedom, and adjusts for imperfect model fit. RMSEA ranges from 0 to 1, with lower statistics indicating better fit. In this model, RMSEA = 0.0594, \( p < 0.05 \), indicating that although the data do not fit the model precisely, they fit reasonably well (Brown). While the data demonstrated reasonable goodness of fit, the chi-square statistic showed discrepancies in the fit of this data to the Chinese and Indian model.

The second step in testing Hypothesis 1 was to submit the data to the Rickel & Biasetti (1982) factors, Responsiveness and Restrictiveness. The model converged after 16 iterations and critical \( N \) was exceeded, but the chi-square degrees of freedom ratio \( (\chi^2/df = 1.935) \) was in the borderline range of acceptability of less than 2.0. This result meant that sample size only just reached the number of known variables sufficient to conduct the analysis. The chi-square based methods of estimating goodness of fit demonstrated that the model from this two factor solution was significantly different from the Ghanaian participants’ responses, \( \chi^2 (701) = 1429.43, p < 0.01, \) CFI = 0.853, RMSEA
= 0.0569, p<0.05. As in the previous analysis, the goodness-of-fit tests based on the chi-square statistic, which is influenced by sample size, suggested that the data did not fit Rickel & Biasetti’s Responsiveness and Restrictiveness factors. However, the RMSEA and CFI showed that a reasonable fit might be present.

To further explore how well the Ghanaian data fit these two models, the individual factor loadings for each latent variable were tested. Results on the Rao model revealed that all but one individual CRPR item identified for the Rao et al. (2003) Authoritative factor loaded with Lambda-X estimates above 0.500 (the conventional cut-off for strongly loading factors is 0.400). CRPR item 5 (“I often feel angry with my child.”) had a low factor loading. The significance of these loadings could not be tested because the failure of this model to converge obviated the calculation of standard errors and Wald statistics. In the Rickel & Biasetti model, all factor loadings for the Responsiveness factor were significant, with loadings ranging from 0.445 to 0.902, p <0.05.

In contrast, many individual item loadings for the Authoritarian (Rao et al., 2003) and Restrictiveness (Rickel & Biasetti, 1982) factors were low and not significant. This result supports the interpretation of Rao and colleagues (2003) that diverse groups tend to ascribe to a fairly consistent factor of acceptance (Rohner & Britner, 2002), responsiveness (Rickel & Biasetti, 1982), or authoritativeness (Rao et al., 2003), but that cultural values differentially impact the manifestation and meaning of parental control, as evidenced here by the poor fit of the Restrictiveness and Authoritarian factors. In summary, the Ghanaian data fit the Authoritative and Responsiveness factors in the
previously published models, but not the Authoritarian or Restrictiveness factors. Table 4 illustrates the goodness of fit indices for each model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Iterations</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\chi^2/df$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rao et al. (2003)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>423.73</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.0594</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickel &amp; Biasetti (1982)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1429.43</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>1.935</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.0569</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both of the above analyses demonstrate some common features across cultures, including the current sample. Both of the previous studies utilized exploratory factor analysis, and both found similar features of responsiveness or authoritativeness, indicating that the definitions of this type of construct across cultures are similar, although not identical, and parents may ascribe to them to varying degrees (Rao et al, 2005; also see Chao, 1994). However, neither of these models accurately identified a consistent factor for the Ghanaian sample that was related to restrictiveness, authoritarianism, or parental control. Therefore, it is logical to proceed with an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with the current sample, to better identify the underlying constructs in this Ghanaian sample.

**Hypothesis One: Exploratory Factor Analysis**

The third step of testing Hypothesis 1 was to enter the Ghanaian CRPR responses an EFA to determine if a different latent factor structure might underlie this data. The
initial EFA was conducted entering all 91 items of the CRPR, and allowing for an unlimited number of factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1, up to 25 iterations, with orthogonal rotation, to determine the appropriate number of factors to model (Costello & Osbourne, 2005). It should be noted that factor analysis, as compared to principal components analysis, relies only on shared variance of items, and therefore tends to yield lower rates of total variance explained (Costello & Osbourne, 2005). The minimum criteria of independence of variables was met, as the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test was greater than 0.6 (Tabatchnik & Fidell, 2001), and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant (p<0.001), indicating that there was enough variance in the matrix to be examined through EFA. Examination of the initial communalities of the 91 CRPR items demonstrated that no variable had collinearity with the matrix over 0.8. In the initial EFA, 29 underlying components were extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1, and these explained 65.4% of the total variance in the model. The scree plot (Figure 3)
indicates that of the 29 factors obtained, 3 factors likely explain most of the variance in the model. The model failed to converge after 25 iterations, possibly due to the high number of factors.

Given that a completely free model did not converge, it was indicated to restrict the number of latent variables. The scree plot (Figure 3) indicated that three factors likely underlie the Ghanaian parents’ responses on the CRPR, in contrast to a two-factor solution observed in Euro-American samples. Therefore, this three factor model was tested in a second EFA, limited to a three factor solution, up to 25 iterations, principal
axis factors extraction, with oblique promax rotation of kappa (4) with Kaiser normalization (see Figure 4).

Figure 4. Factor Plot of Three Factor Solution

The oblique rotation was initially selected because past research has demonstrated that various parenting constructs, such as responsiveness and restrictiveness, are correlated. Allowing such factors to correlate is often thought to be confusing or yield a less parsimonious model, but in reality many factors in the social sciences coincide, and the model should reflect this (Costello & Osbourne, 2005). The EFA model converged in 7 iterations, and three factors explained 20.13% of the variance. Of the 91 CRPR items, 57 mapped onto at least one factor with loadings greater than 0.300. Only two items loaded
onto multiple factors, and these items loaded inversely. Factors 1 and 2 were moderately correlated ($r = 0.252$; see Table 5).

Table 5. Correlation Matrix of CRPR Three Factor Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Responsiveness – Nurturing</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restrictiveness – Disciplining</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communalism - Intradependence</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DeVellis (2003) reported that if factors had a low correlation (i.e., less than 0.15), then an orthogonal rotation might be a better fit for the data. If factors are truly uncorrelated, then results from the orthogonal and oblique rotation techniques should be very similar (Costello & Osbourne, 2005). As a check, the above analysis was also run with an orthogonal rotation to determine if any differences would appear compared to the oblique rotation. In fact, the orthogonal EFA yielded widely different results. Given that at least two of the three factors in the oblique EFA were correlated, it is more appropriate to proceed using the oblique rotation. In this case, the oblique promax rotation yielded the most parsimonious factor structure (see Osbourne & Costello, 2005; DeVellis, 2003).

The three factor solution from the oblique EFA is displayed in Table 6. These factors clustered into three main themes of parenting practices. In the next paragraphs, each factor will be explored and the rationale for naming the factor will be explained.
Table 6. Exploratory Factor Analysis Three-Factor Pattern Matrix

Factor 1: Responsiveness-Cherishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>52. I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what s/he tries to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accomplish.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>40. I joke and play with my child.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>42. My child and I have warm, intimate times together.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>53. I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>45. I encourage my child to be curious, to explore and question things.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>76. I make sure I know where my child is and what s/he is doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>11. I feel a child should be given comfort and understanding when s/he is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scared or upset.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>88. I get pleasure from seeing my child eating well and enjoying his/her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>71. I feel that it is good for a child to play competitive games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>19. I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my child.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>2. I encourage my child always to do his/her best.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>51. I believe in praising a child when s/he is good and think it gets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>better results than punishing him/her when s/he is bad.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>46. I sometimes talk about God and religious ideas in explaining things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>61. I give my child extra privileges when s/he behaves well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>38. I talk it over and reason with my child when s/he misbehaves.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>44. I think one has to let a child take many chances as s/he grows up and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tries new things.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>77. I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods. †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>22. I usually take into account my child’s preferences in making plans for the family. †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>18. I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child. †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>34. I am easy going and relaxed with my child. †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>47. I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages s/he has. ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>58. When I am angry with my child, I let him/her know it. ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>35. I give up some of my own interests because of my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>62. I enjoy having the house full of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>87. I believe it is very important for a child to play outside and get plenty of fresh air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>1. I respect my child’s opinions and encourage him/her to express them. †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>69. There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me. †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>59. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others. ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>74. I want my child to make a good impression on others. ‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>49. I believe in toilet training a child as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>8. I watch closely what my child eats and when s/he eats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>24. I feel a child should have time to think, daydream, and even loaf sometimes. †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>39. I trust my child to behave as s/he should, even when I am not with him/her. †</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items included in Rickel & Biasetti’s (1982) Responsiveness factor that are excluded from Factor 1: 5, 15
Table 6, continued

Factor 2: Restrictiveness – Containment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Content:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>83. I control my child by warning him/her about the bad things that can happen to him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>79. I instruct my child not to get dirty while s/he is playing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>13. I try to stop my child from playing rough games or doing things where s/he might get hurt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>82. I think children must learn early not to cry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>65. I believe my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>68. I worry about the health of my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>81. I think jealousy and quarreling between brothers and sisters should be punished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>28. I worry about the bad and sad things that can happen to a child as s/he grows up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>63. I believe that too much affection and tenderness can harm or weaken a child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>73. I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when s/he misbehaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>89. I don’t allow my child to tease or play tricks on others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>10. I wish my spouse were more interested in our children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>15. I believe that a child should be seen and not heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>64. I believe that scolding and criticism makes my child improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>12. I try to keep my child away from children or families who have different ideas or values from our own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6, continued

*Items included in Rickel & Biasetti’s (1982) Restrictiveness factor that are excluded from Factor 2: 47, 29, 55, 54, 27, 57, 74, 59, 85, 9, 70.*

Factor 3: Restrictiveness – Intradependence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>37. I have never caught my child lying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>6. If my child gets into trouble, I expect him/her to handle the problem mostly by himself/herself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.369</td>
<td>2. I encourage my child always to do his/her best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>69. There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>67. I teach my child that s/he is responsible for what happens to him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>41. I give my child a good many duties and family responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>43. I have strict, well-established rules for my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>7. I punish my child by putting him/her off somewhere by himself/herself for a while.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>60. I punish my child by taking away a privilege s/he otherwise would have had.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>48. I sometimes feel that I am too involved with my child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>70. I do not allow my child to question my decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* = Item loads inversely onto Factors 1 and 3

† = Item identified in Rickel & Biasetti’s (1982) Nurturance factor

*b* = Item identified in Rickel & Biasetti’s (1982) Restrictiveness factor

Factor 1: Responsiveness – Cherishing

Factor 1 contained 33 items and was given the name Responsiveness-Cheering because it contained many items related to listening to a child’s opinions and ideas, expressing love and positive emotions, nurturing a child’s physical and emotional growth, rewarding good behavior, and verbally encouraging the child to do well. Some characteristic items from Factor 1 were “I make sure I know where my child is and what s/he is doing,” “My child and I have warm, intimate times together,” “I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles,” “I get pleasure from seeing my child eating well and enjoying his/her food,” and “I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what s/he tries to accomplish.”

Several of the items loading on Factor 1 overlapped with those loading onto Rickel & Biasetti’s (1982) Nurturance factor. The factor derived from the current sample contained all but two of the Nurturance items, making this factor similar to Baumrind’s (1967) construct of responsiveness. Factor 1 included several additional items not identified on Rickel & Biasetti’s Nurturance scale. These items, listed in Table 4, included statements that indicated an emphasis on individual achievement, such as, “I feel that it is good for a child to play competitive games,” and “I encourage my child always to do his/her best.” Other items seemed to focus on a high level of attention paid to a child’s bodily needs, such as, “I watch closely what my child eats and when s/he eats,” “I get pleasure from seeing my child eating well and enjoying his/her food,” and “I believe in toilet training a child as soon as possible.” Factor 1 also included items that indicated enjoyment of the parent role, self-sacrifice, and delight in children, such as, “I
enjoy having the house full of children,” “I give up some of my own interests because of my child,” and “I believe it is very important for a child to play outside and get plenty of fresh air.” Factor 1 also contained two items that load onto Rickel & Biasetti’s Restrictiveness factor. These are “I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages s/he has,” and “I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.” Taken together, the analysis indicated that items related to responsiveness clustered together with items related to personal responsibility for the child.

Several items on Factor 1 were similar to features of parenting referred to as warmth, which have been identified among African American parents (McLoyd, 2002; Deater-Deckard, et al…) and in parents in collectivist cultures (Dekovic, 2004; Rohner & Britner, 2002; Rudy & Grusec, 1997). Therefore, it might seem reasonable to describe Factor 1 derived from the current sample as a hybrid of the Baumrind responsiveness construct and the warmth construct. However, the term warmth is an idiom of speech that may not translate cross-culturally with the same figurative or connotative meaning. It is more accurate to describe the warmth of Factor 1 with another word meaning caring, nurturing, and encouraging. Other items on Factor 1 point to enjoyment in the act of parenting, watchfulness of the child’s physical well-being, and giving up some of one’s own interests for the sake of one’s child. As a group, the items on Factor 1 indicate responsiveness, child-centeredness, sensitivity to children’s experiences, encouragement toward achievement, and enjoyment of parenting. Therefore, Factor 1 was termed Responsiveness – Cherishing
**Factor 2: Restrictiveness – Containment**

Factor 2 included 15 items, many of which describe limiting a child’s behavior through punishment or scolding, disinclination toward tenderness, and discouraging children’s freedom of expression. Some of these items overlapped with the published restrictiveness factor (Rickel & Biasetti, 1982), but there were many discrepancies, as listed in Table 4. Some of the items on Factor 2 that are similar to the published restrictiveness factors included, “I control my child by warning him/her about the bad things that can happen to him/her,” “I instruct my child not to get dirty while s/he is playing,” “I try to keep my child away from children or families who have different ideas or values from our own,” “I believe my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for him/her,” “I believe that scolding and criticism makes my child improve,” and “I believe that a child should be seen and not heard.” The items comprising Factor 2 described both behavioral control and psychological control, characterized by parental direction and control through guilt (see Barber et al., 2005).

However, along with items overlapping with Rickel & Biasetti’s Restrictiveness factor, several additional items loaded onto Factor 2, including items related to worry about children’s safety. Some of these were “I try to stop my child from playing rough games or doing things where s/he might get hurt,” and “I worry about the bad and sad things that can happen to a child as s/he grows up.” Other items seem to express a desire for greater family unity or cooperative behavior, such as, “I wish my spouse were more interested in our children,” “I think jealousy and quarreling between brothers and sisters should be punished,” and “I don’t allow my child to tease or play tricks on others.”
Taken together, these additional items indicate an inclination to shield children from dangers, increase family cohesion, and instill moral values.

Factor 2 contains items related to behavioral limitations, psychological control, and firm parental authority, in combination with an emphasis on maintaining children’s physical safety. With respect to freedom of expression of thoughts and emotions, Factor 2 contrasts sharply with the Responsiveness – Cherishing factor, in that the items on the first factor included items encouraging a child’s freedom of expression, whereas the items on Factor 2 were associated with suppression of children’s emotions. Factor 2 also contained items that discourage parental expression of caring feelings toward children, and lacked items related to enjoyment of the parental role. Lastly, Factor 2 notably contained items related to worry about harmful things happening to one’s child, and the wish to protect children from problems. In sum, Factor 2 included themes of parental dominance, emotional containment, and sheltering children; therefore, on the basis of these concepts, Factor 2 was labeled Restrictiveness – Containment.

Factor 3: Restrictiveness – Intradependence

Factor 3 contained 11 items related to a variety of concepts. The most highly loading item was “I have never caught my child lying,” which may represent a high demand for obedience, minimization of a child’s individual transgressions, or rejection of a child’s point of view. Factor 3 also included the item “I sometimes feel that I am too involved with my child,” which may indicate a desire for the child to become self-sufficient. This notion of self-sufficiency in combination with responsibility to authority
also resonated with the items “If my child gets into trouble, I expect him/her to handle the problem mostly by himself/herself.” and “I teach my child that s/he is responsible for what happens to him/her.” Factor 3 therefore has some similarities with Responsiveness – Cherishing, in that both factors promote individual responsibility. However, while Responsiveness – Cherishing promotes children’s outstanding achievement, Factor 3 discourages individual achievement, including a negative loading for the item “I encourage my child to always do his/her best.” Factor 3 also included the items indicating a preference for child submission, including, “I don’t let my child question my decision,” and “I have strict, well-established rules for my child.”

At first glance, a Euro-American perspective might interpret the items on Factor 3 as related to harsh authoritarian parenting. This concept seems to be epitomized by the item “There is a great deal of conflict between my child and me.” However, other items do not fit the notion of harsh parenting. For example, the only disciplinary item on Factor 3 was not indicative of corporal punishment. Instead, Factor 3 included the item “I punish my child by putting him/her off somewhere by himself/herself for a while,” which suggests that temporary exile from the community is undesirable. Factor 3 also included an item related to discipline by removal of privileges. This contrasted to items on both of the other two factors. Items on Responsiveness – Cherishing appeared to encourage moral discussion and problem solving, and items on Restrictiveness – Containment included active physical discipline.

Overall, the items on Factor 3 seemed to promote respect for parental authority, as well as the development of self-sufficiency. Parenting practices described by the items
on this factor appear to encourage each child to be responsible for himself or herself, and to be accountable to parents and the community. The differentiating concept between each of the three factors is related to power: *Responsiveness – Cherishing* promotes child autonomy with a communicative connection to parents, *Restrictiveness – Containment* indicates child dependence on parental authority for behavioral control and protection. Factor 3 shares some features of restrictiveness, but demonstrates a different power dynamic. Personal observation by the primary investigator of families in Ghana supported the notion that parents who fit the factor 3 items also tend to endorse collectivist values. Parents foster community harmony by encouraging compliance with group norms and values, and self-reliance as an extension of contributing to the group. Therefore, factor 3 was labeled *Restrictiveness – Intradependence*.

Intradependence was a new term created to describe the style of relating observed on factor 3, and based on the primary investigator’s experiences and discussions with psychologists, graduate students, parents, and children in Ghana. The term intradependence describes a sense of belonging, accompanied by hierarchical extrinsic governance and intrinsic responsibility to oneself and the group. In essence, exhibiting intradependence demonstrates responsibility for others to serve oneself, and responsibility for oneself to serve others. Parents who endorse items on the *Restrictiveness – Intradependence* factor expect their children to develop a high degree of behavioral and emotional control, and furthermore expect them to function skillfully in society, respect authority, and demonstrate understanding of family and community norms.
Intradependence is a more specific descriptor of this factor than other terms that have been used in the literature to describe non-Euro-American cultural influences, such as collectivism or communalism, which are used broadly in the psychological literature to refer to many concepts in non-Euro-American societies that describe connection to a central power or community (Rudy & Grusec, 2006). Intradependence is related to the concept of interdependence, which describes mutual reliance upon one another by community members, and deference to how members fit into a hierarchy. Using Triandis’ (1995) Horizontal and Vertical levels of Individualism and Collectivism, Intradependence would be a hybrid of high Vertical Collectivism and high Horizontal Individualism, whereas Vertical Collectivism denotes belonging to an in-group in which a hierarchy reigns and self-sacrifice for the group is valued, and Horizontal Individualism implies some sense of an autonomous self, but the self is equal to members of the in-group (see also Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

In items on the Restrictiveness – Intradependence factor, participants indicated beliefs that children are members of an in-group, must defer to authorities, and may sacrifice for authorities, but also endorsed items implying that children should have opportunities to problem solve outside of the group, take personal responsibility, and excel at tasks.

In Intradependent communities, adults receive external rewards for children’s service to the group (i.e. children do chores, care for other children, or otherwise reduce the workload burden for parents). Additionally, adults receive emotional rewards when their children comply with community norms and succeed at individual tasks, in the form of pride at raising well-bred children, and securing esteem from higher authorities in the
community. Children benefit from a secure emotional attachment to the group, as well as support for group-sanctioned individual pursuits. This feedback loop (see Figure 5) of positive rewards between parent and child, parent and community, and child and community illustrates the part-whole relationship of responsibility to and for others, and to and for oneself.

The items on Factor 3 describe strong parental governance as well as the connection of each person to the whole community. Research in several Asian cultural groups has explored a similar concept of filial piety (Chao, 1994; Rao et al., 2003), which translates to a strict parenting style intent on teaching children deference to authority, and training them to achieve goals set by parents and the community. In Chinese culture, the inculcation of filial piety includes aspects of training children that they can achieve anything through hard work, rather than relying only on innate talent, and communicating training concepts through clear, prescriptive instructions expressed with care for the child’s success (Chao, 1994). Filial piety is expressed to varying degrees across different cultural groups, in combination with other factors of parenting that are unique to these societies’ cultural values (Chao, 1994; Rao et al., 2003; Stewart et al., 1999). In Ghana, filial piety may not fully describe the concepts identified on the Restrictiveness – Intradependence factor: whereas filial piety manifests as a high degree of parental involvement and prescriptive instruction, the items endorsed on Restrictiveness – Intradependence illustrate desire for children to manage problems without adult help, rather than seeking a high degree of guidance and advice before acting. In this way, the
current sample expresses a wish for the child to act independently, but in accordance with social norms.

Additional Analyses

The initial exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted with all 322 participants, resulting in the 3 factors listed above. As a reliability check, the sample was randomly divided in half and the analysis was repeated to determine if the same model would emerge. First, a random sample of 161 of the 322 participants was selected and entered into a new EFA. Three factors emerged which mostly mapped onto the

*Responsiveness – Cherishing, Restrictiveness – Containment, and Restrictiveness – Intradependence* factors. The composition of each factor in these two EFAs was compared, resulting in significant kappa agreement for positive, negative, or non-loading items (*kappas* = 0.77, 0.63, and 0.74, respectively). The agreement between items in the original EFA and the split EFA is confounded to some extent by the fact that the original EFA factors were derived in part from the same data in the split EFA. Nonetheless, it is useful to note that the split-half CFA resulted in a similar 3 factor structure. To confirm the factor structure of the split-half EFA, the unused half of the sample was analyzed using the split EFA model. Results indicated that although the fit for this second sample was not perfect, there was likely a reasonably good fit of the model from the first half to the second half of the data, \( \chi^2(2005) = 3431.88, p < 0.05; \) CFI = 0.700; RMSEA = 0.06, \( p < 0.05 \). Given that the split-half reliability resulted in factor structure with \( r \) agreement to
the original EFA model, the 3 factor structure of Responsiveness – Cherishing, Restrictiveness – Containment, and Restrictiveness – Intradependence was retained.

In summary, Hypothesis 1 explored whether existing models for the CRPR fit the Ghanaian sample, or if a unique factor structure was a significantly better fit for the current data. Results indicated that while existing models based on Asian and American samples shared many features with patterns in the Ghanaian data, the chi-square tests indicated significant difference from the model to the data. In the case of the Restrictiveness and Responsiveness scales, too many free covariances and not enough known information precluded the possibility of using chi-square to measure goodness of fit. Therefore, the analyses relied upon other indices of goodness of fit, which are not dependent on chi-square or sample size, such as RMSEA, and CFI.

Because chi-square goodness of fit was not an appropriate index for these analyses, it was not possible to precisely test the difference between the fit of the previously published factor structures and the new exploratory model derived from the current sample. In the EFA factor structure for derived directly from the Ghanaian sample, degrees of freedom were too low to test for improvements in fit based on chi-square. It is assumed that the model derived from EFA is a near perfect fit for the data. The previously published models had reasonable fit, but precise improvement in fit could not be directly tested through comparative CFA analysis due to sample size limitations and the high number of variable this comparative analysis would involve. In sum, it can be assumed that the new factor structure of Responsiveness-Cherishing, Restrictiveness-
Containment, and Restrictiveness-Intradependence is the best fit for this data, but the exact improvement in fit over other models cannot be quantified using this sample size.

**Step Three: Analyses of Qualitative Parent Interviews**

Hypothesis Two: Parental role, religion, and discipline

Hypothesis Two proposed that exploratory analysis of qualitative data from parent interviews, in conjunction with the CRPR factor loadings, could provide additional perspectives about Ghanaian parenting styles. Thirty participants engaged in the audio-recorded Qualitative Parenting Interview. Questions for this interview are listed in Appendix D with common responses grouped by thematic code. Responses were transcribed by undergraduate research assistants and examined for accuracy by the primary investigator. Response themes for each question were identified by the primary investigator and coded for each response. Each response could receive multiple codes, as many respondents spoke about more than one theme. Reliability and applicability of these themes was assessed through independent coding of the responses by graduate students in the Masters of Philosophy – Clinical Psychology program at the University of Ghana, Legon. The following sections will summarize the results and reliabilities for interview responses and thematic codes. The questions and frequency of thematic codes are listed in Table 7. Questions are labeled by their numerical order listed on the guidelines for the Qualitative Parenting Interview; however, questions were asked in any order that seemed to the interviewer to facilitate a conversational style in the interview.
Some grammar has been modified for ease of comprehension for an American reading audience, and these changes have been notated with brackets.

Table 7. Thematic Codes for Qualitative Parent Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Thematic Code &amp; Definition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.) What is a parent? What makes someone a parent?</td>
<td>Protect from negative influences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare for adult roles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide basic needs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility – ambiguous</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloodlines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impart faith (religion)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Express caring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) How does your faith or religion teach you to treat your children?</td>
<td>Faith as emotional support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious practices</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Express caring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach morals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impart faith</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depart from old ways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith not relevant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faith not important, undefined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.) What do you do when your child misbehaves?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment: rationale</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoke religion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove privileges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give rewards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show anger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.) How are children who are growing up today different from your generation? How do you handle this in your family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased closeness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased communication</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased freedom of expression</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of technology/modernization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revive traditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighter punishments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.) What is important for American researchers like me to know about coming to Ghana? What do you want us to do, or not do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural liaison helpful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wary of misrepresentation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness of attitudes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness of poverty/wealth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 1: What is a parent?

Parents were asked to respond in any way they wished to describe the definition of a parent. Some parents also added notions about the definition of a good parent. From these responses, nine themes were identified and seven generated reliable coded responses (see reliability procedures in Methods section). Many parents described more than one theme. These themes, their definitions, and their frequencies are listed in Table 7. Examples of responses for each question and each theme are listed in Appendix E.

For Question 1, thirteen parents (43%) described some type of ambiguous or general responsibility. Eight participants (26%) defined a parent as someone who expresses caring or love to a child through physical or verbal affection. Five participants (17%) described that a parent is someone who provides for children’s basic needs. Four participants (13%) stated explicitly that parents need to prepare children for adult roles. Two participants (6%) defined parenthood by bloodlines or biological relationship, but two others contradicted this theme by stating that biological relationships are not necessary, and a care-giving relationship is all that is required for an adult to be a parent to an unrelated child. Two (6%) described a parent as someone who imparts faith to their children. One participant (3%) defined a parent as someone who protects children from...
negative influences. Two other themes which were not reliably coded defined as parent as someone who sets firm limits, and someone who needs support or guidance from the community to raise children. Overall, participants in this sample described a parent as someone who is responsible for a child’s care, provides affection and basic needs, and prepares a child to take on adult roles, including religious traditions.

**Question 2: How does your religion influence parenting?**

Parents were asked to comment on how their faith or religion teaches them to treat their children, or otherwise influences parenting practices. One person (3%) reported that faith does not impact his parenting practices. Eleven participants (36%) stated that their religion aids them to teach children morals and moral conduct. Eight (26%) described religion as encouraging them to express affection and caring to their children. Five (16%) specifically cited that imparting faith is part of a parent’s responsibility. Three parents (10%) described that they want their children to learn religious practices. One parent (3%) cited faith as emotional support for the child when the parent cannot be there to provide support. One (3%) described faith as a catalyst for departure from old ways, particularly from heavy-handed punishments to more verbal and relationship forms of discipline. One parent (3%) stated that faith plays a role in child-rearing but did not elaborate.

Overall, the quality of these responses did not differ from the literature on Euro-American parenting practices. In general, Ghana is a highly religious and strongly faithful society, whereas North America and Europe tend to place relatively more
emphasis on secular values. While there is great variation in all of these broad national and regional groups, it is possible that Ghanaian parents reference faith and religion more frequently or more emphatically than their Euro-American counterparts.

**Question 3: What do you do when your child misbehaves?**

Parents were asked to describe how they respond to misbehavior and tell a story about a time that their child misbehaved. Participants described a variety of disciplinary responses. Many parents emphasized alternatives to physical punishment, but many also endorsed it. A distinction was drawn in the thematic coding between corporal punishment with the intent of generating fear in the child, and corporal punishment accompanied by an explanation of the parent’s rationale for restricting behavior. However, through the process of comparing three independent coders, the theme of corporal punishment with fear was not reliably rated, and eventually was dropped. For Question 3, thirteen participants (43%) reported that they use some form of corporal punishment accompanied by a rationale or used physical punishment sparingly. An equal number (43%) reported using a lecture to discipline, with or without physical punishment. Nine (30%) described using some form of negotiation or dialogue with the child to determine consequences, usually considering the child’s intent, the gravity of the child’s misbehavior, and the child’s expected level of responsibility. Six parents (20%) reported that they remove privileges from a child to punish misbehavior. Four parents (13%) stated that they invoke religion to generate shame and guilt in the child for sinning against God or other people. One parent (3%) described giving rewards for good
behavior. One parent (3%) described demonstrating anger through non-verbal behavior, such as facial expression, to inspire fear or guilt in children.

In summary, many parents in the current sample reported use of corporal punishment with a rationale, which is consistent with studies of parents of other African heritage around the world. Corporal punishment without rationale, or for the purpose of instilling fear, was not reliably coded in this sample, indicating a departure from the style termed harsh parenting practices (Baumrind, 1997). Several parents commented that they explicitly refrain from using corporal punishment when they are angry or emotional, which is the inverse of a risk factor related to authoritarian parenting in Euro-American cultures (McLoyd, 2002).

Interestingly, the use of negotiation, usually associated with authoritative parenting in Euro-American cultures, was reported by almost a third of this sample. This may reflect the portion of parents who endorsed the Responsiveness-Cherishing factor, which was tested in the Ancillary Analyses section below. The examples parents gave regarding misbehavior reflected a high expectations for obedience. Participants tended to cite minor misdemeanors, such as squabbling with other children, petty theft, and lying. No participants referenced temper tantrums, oppositional behavior, or serious misconduct. These examples indicate that parents in this sample place high demands on children to uphold social norms and mores, and seem to have less tolerance for children’s misbehavior than in many Euro-American societies.
Questions 1-3 on the qualitative parent questionnaire yielded subjective data related to attitudes toward parenting, religious influences, and disciplinary practices. The responses related to defining parenthood reflected general terms, such as providing for the child’s physical and emotional needs, give spiritual guidance, and prepare the child to adopt prosocial adult roles. These definitions of parenting seemed in line with universal definitions, perhaps with greater emphasis on spiritual traditions than some Euro-American cultures. With respect to religion or faith, all but one parent in this sample endorsed ways in which their faith plays a role in their parenting practices. Most parents described imparting faith or religious traditions as a parental task, as well as using faith or religious teachings a guide for managing many aspects of parenting. The emphatic undertones of many of the parents’ responses illustrate that faith is a central aspect of Ghanaian life, in contrast to secular and democratic priorities endorsed in many Euro-American groups. Strongly held religious beliefs and respect for religious practices may be a reflection of traditional kinship relationships, which value deference to authority and group cooperation. These responses align with the Restrictiveness-Intradependence factor from the CRPR EFA.

With respect to discipline, parents in this sample tended to endorse the use of corporal punishment accompanied by rationale, lecturing to children about their misdeeds, or both. Many of these parental responses seemed to reflect disciplinary methods loading on the Restrictiveness-Containment factor. A minority of parents denied the use of corporal punishment, and several of these individuals endorsed
negotiation, removal of privileges, or other disciplinary styles that are generally associated with authoritative parenting in Euro-American groups. These parents’ responses seemed to fit the Responsiveness-Cherishing factor, but it should be noted that the negotiation described by the current sample tended to maintain clear authority for the parent. Lastly, several parents described invoking religious or interpersonal guilt, in a way that implied that the child would be shunned if he or she did not change their problematic behaviors. These responses fit with the Restrictiveness-Intradependence factor, reflecting that banishment from the community, whether emotional, spiritual, or physical, was highly undesirable.

Hypothesis Three: Generational Changes

Hypothesis Three proposed that parents in the sample would endorse qualitative changes in the way they interact with their children compared to the way they were parented in their formative years. This hypothesis was based on the supposition that secular changes, such as shifts in political government, technology, and an influx of immigrants, ideas, and material products from Asian, Europe, and North America, would lead to broad changes in parenting practices. This hypothesis was tested by asking parents to indicate how their parenting practices might have differed compared to how they were raised.
Question 4: How are children today different from your generation, and how do you handle this?

In the conversational interview, clarifications sometimes were added to the question, and parents were asked if they felt a generation gap, or how did they handle the generation gap. The question was also clarified as asking if the way the participants treated their children was different from the way they were treated as a children. The themes coded for these responses were distributed as follows: five parents (17%) described increased closeness or intimacy with their children, eleven (37%) reported increased communication, nine parents (30%) described their children as having increased freedom of expression, eleven parents (37%) commented on the impact of technology or modernization, one parent (3%) described a desire to revive traditional ways or go back to the ways he or she was parented, and six parent (20%) reported that they used lighter punishments than their parents did.

The two most common themes identified in the participants’ responses were the impact of rapid developments in technology and increased communication with this generation compared to their childhoods. Eleven parents (36%) reported some impact from technology or modernization that has either changed the way they parent or forced them to shift their attitudes. Some referenced that children today have influences from other cultures through music, television, and the internet, and are influenced by aspects of these other cultures. A few parents described the need to shelter children from such outside influences, citing that the ways of dressing or talking back that children pick up from Euro-American cultures are problematic. Other parents explained how technology
has made their lives easier, particularly for women, who can maintain cellular phone or internet communication with their children, freeing them to pursue careers outside of the home. Other improvements from technology were cited, such as higher levels of information and education available to children today. Finally, some parents cited technology as a catalyst for shifting roles in the family, as children may learn and adopt new technology faster than adults, and these parents relied on children for assistance with technological advances. Overall, many parents reported that technology, globalization, and modernization are changing family connections and power dynamics, although most spoke of these changes positively.

In addition to technology, many parents also reported a trend that their children have increased communication with parents, and greater freedom of expression than the parents had when they were young. Several participants recalled that in their generation, children did not question adults’ authority. Participants expressed mixed views as to the reason for this generational shift, with some expressing concern that their children would not be as respectful or hardworking as they had been. However, most parents described children’s greater communication and expression as a positive shift, and cited that they had felt stifled or hurt as children. Many voiced a desire to provide their children with opportunities to voice opinions, and reported wishing to hear and understand their child’s perspective on the world. Several parents, however, warned that while greater communication is an improvement from the past, friendship with ones’ children is not appropriate. One mother described that she hopes to be a “friend, but not a friend,” with her child, implying a distinction between peer friendships and parent-child relationships.
Another area of change that parents reported was disciplinary practices. Several parents recounted that they experienced harsh or even abusive punishments on a regular basis, such as severe beatings, enforced fasting, and ginger or pepper applied to the genitals or other parts of the body. No parents in this study admitted to applying harsh punishments such as these to their own children. Many cited that when they were children, their parents either ascribed to traditional indigenous religions or harsher religious ideologies than parents practice in the present, and that contemporary religious leaders teach that lighter punishments are aligned with theology. Others reported that they had strong memories of the suffering they endured as children, and stated that they did not want their own children to experience it.

**Hypothesis 3 Summary**

All of the parents in this sample reported that notions about proper parenting in Ghanaian society have changed in the time since their childhoods. Only two parents reported no major differences in parenting style compared to his parents. One respondent stated that children today misbehave more than in the past, and he endorsed strict order, assigning children many tasks, and applying physical punishment to build character and discipline. The other respondent described that both he and his parents promoted an easy flow of communication, emotional relatedness, and moderate punishments, but noted that his parents were quite liberal for their time. The most frequent theme regarding change was the impact of technology and modern influences on family communication, power dynamics, and access to information. Parents expressed a variety of opinions about the
benefits and dangers for children related to technology, indicating that this is a complicated issue that is still unfolding. Many parents also expressed fostering increased communication and dialogue with their children, in contrast to their own childhoods, when expression of ideas and opinions by a child was viewed as disorderly and impolite. Lastly, several parents described harsh or abusive punishments that their parents inflicted upon them, and reported that even when they use corporal punishment, they do not force their children to suffer as they did. Overall, parents described a strong shift in the past generation from strict demands for obedience and respect towards parents, to an increasingly dialectic or democratic balance between parental demands and child desires.

Hypothesis Four: Intercultural Research Perspectives

Question 5: What is important for American researchers like me to know about coming to Ghana? What do you want us to do, or not do?

Hypothesis Four proposed an exploratory analysis of participants views of Euro-American research and researchers in general, and of participating in this study designed and executed by a foreign researcher. Most parents described a desire for foreign researchers to study Ghanaian culture well, to avoid drawing incorrect conclusions from the study findings. Eleven parents (37%) encouraged cultural awareness of attitudes, four parents (13%) described a need for cultural awareness of traditional practices, one parent (3%) encouraged cultural awareness of the nature of poverty and wealth in Ghana, two parents (6%) suggested that bringing a culturally familiar liaison was helpful, and five participants (17%) urged that the researcher take care to avoid misrepresenting Ghanaian
life by drawing reckless conclusions. Two parents (6%) offered pragmatic advice to
visitors to Ghana, one parent (3%) requested that the research result in some sort of
parent training program, and one participant (3%) provided additional comments on
parenting practices.

The most common response, endorsed by 37% of the sample, was encouraging
cultural awareness. Participants who described this theme suggested that researchers find
out about Ghanaian culture before arriving to do research, as well as considering
suggestions to revise their goals when they arrive. Some suggestions included reading
books on Ghana, recognizing commonalities with American culture, and collaborating
with Ghanaians. Many participants were well acquainted with American parenting
styles, through television, movies, and life experiences of visiting or living in the United
States. They commented that American parents allow greater freedom of expression and
independence from a young age. In contrast, they noted that in Ghana, freedom of
expression is valued, but it is coupled with guidance from parents so that children are not
put into situations which could harm them. One parent stated that American parents
allow too much freedom, and do not teach their children to respect elders. This
participant stated, “I would not even want to leave my child in America.” As an
anecdote, another participant described a similar sentiment in conversation after the
recorder had been turned off, stating that her nephew developed behavioral problems
when her sister moved to the United States. The nephew was sent to live with this
participant, to experience a Ghanaian childhood and learn respect for authority. Thus,
several participants advised that Euro-American researchers should not assume that Euro-
American parenting practices are most effective. Other participants reiterated in another fashion by advising that researchers should not advocate one parenting style as better than another.

In this vein, 13% of the sample emphasized that it was important for foreign researchers to understand traditional practices. Several respondents advised researchers to visit rural villages to see Ghanaian cultures in their “pure” forms, undisturbed by urban influences like television, radio, and intermingling of ethnic groups. Also in the cities, researchers should recognize that Ghanaian culture is less individualistic and does not limit parenting to the nuclear family, and that any adult may correct a child who is misbehaving.

A number of parents (17%) expressed concern that results of the study or similar cross-national studies could be used to misrepresent Ghanaians. For instance, one participant stressed the importance of looking beyond statistical scores to carefully interpret their meaning in context. Another parent asserted that Euro-American values should not be used to judge behavior in African society, because the “situational ethics” are different with regards to personal freedoms and authority structures. Two participants were wary of outsiders misrepresenting child rights issues in Ghana. They explained that previous researchers have unjustly extrapolated that individual instances of child rights abuses are representative of the cultural norms, but that similar cases of child abuse or exploitation in Euro-American countries are not assumed to represent all members of those societies. As a group, these participants warned the researcher to interpret results carefully and appreciate cultural context.
Two participants (6%) suggested that it would be helpful to collaborate with Ghanaians or engage a cultural liaison to assist in the research process. It is notable that both of these participants were interviewed by the primary investigator, rather than a Ghanaian research collaborator, although the Ghanaian liaison accompanied the primary investigator. These participants suggested that having a local person aid with the research would help some people feel comfortable participating. They also suggested that having a translator available and allowing people to participate through an interview rather than filling out forms would better fit the preferences of many people. Two other participants (6%) gave pragmatic advice on health concerns, safety, and comfort when traveling in Africa. These comments were meant to educate future foreign researchers about the practical issues of conducting studies in Ghana and neighboring countries.

Lastly, one parent requested that after the research is completed, the findings should be used to educate parents nationwide. This participant stated that parent education programs would be beneficial, because although most people know how to care for children or for their home, there are certain stressors that overwhelm some parents. The research could be used to generate parent training programs to help parents deal with problems and questions that they have.

**Hypothesis Four Summary**

Overall, all of the participants in this sample were forthcoming with suggestions regarding recommendations to Euro-American researchers planning to conduct studies in Ghana. The exploratory analysis yielded several themes, including the need for
awareness of cultural issues, wariness of misrepresentation, and methods for improving the cultural considerations and logistics of the research.

**Step Four: Ancillary Analyses**

Given that the exploratory factor analysis revealed unique CRPR factors of parenting, it was possible to formulate additional analyses based on this structure. Two types of analyses were proposed to explore how these factors are associated with other variables in the study. Exploratory analyses were carried out to determine which, if any, demographic variables correlated with scores on one or more of the new CRPR factors of Responsiveness-Cherishing, Restrictiveness-Containing, and Restrictiveness-Intradependence. Second, the most common themes from the parent interviews were identified and submitted to non-parametric tests to determine if any of the interview responses were associated with the CRPR factors.

**Demographic Correlates**

Factor scores were calculated for each participant for the factors identified above for the purpose of comparing groups of participants, as well as placing each participant at a point on the factor. There are several available methods for creating factor scores. Unrefined methods, such as arithmetic sums, means, or weighted sums, are intuitive and easy to interpret, but do not include all the statistical information that the EFA generated. Refined methods of estimating factor scores are linear combinations of the shared variance and error variance for each item loaded onto a factor (DiStefano, Zhu, &
Mindrila, 2009). There are several options available through statistical software packages to calculate factor scores, such as Bartlett’s, Anderson-Rubin, or regression scores. Regression scores maximize validity, meaning that the factor score is highly correlated with the actual factor, but can be biased by correlations among factors. Anderson-Rubin scores are most appropriate for orthogonal rotation solutions. As this EFA was an oblique factor analysis, Bartlett’s scores provided a combination of valid estimates of each case’s placement on the latent factors, with low bias from intercorrelations (DiStefano et al, 2009; see Table 8).

Table 8. Bartlett Scores for Three Factor Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bartlett Scores</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness-Cherishing</td>
<td>-6.176</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>0.912*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness-Containing</td>
<td>-3.751</td>
<td>2.129</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>0.979*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness-Intradependence</td>
<td>-2.251</td>
<td>3.627</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>0.957*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes significance at the p < 0.05 alpha level.
Figure 5. Q-Q Plot for Responsiveness-Cherishing Bartlett Scores

Figure 6. Q-Q Plot for Restrictiveness-Containment Bartlett Scores
Bartlett scores are standardized around a mean of 0, and all three factor scores were normally distributed (Figures 5-7). MANOVA analyses were run for each factor score with the categorical demographic variables as predictors. Table 9 lists the F statistics and groupwise significance for each factor score, and Table 10 shows post-hoc contrasts. For demographic variables on a continuous scale, Table 11 lists Pearson correlations. Groupwise alpha level for the correlations was submitted to a Bonferroni correction, and alpha was then set to 0.004.

**Responsiveness-Cherishing**

Results indicated that the only demographic feature that was significantly linked to this factor was the age of parent respondents. Age was negatively correlated with
factor scores for Responsiveness-Cherishing ($r = -0.170, p < 0.0001$; see Table 11), such that younger participants scored higher on this factor than

Table 9. MANOVA Results for Bartlett Factor Scores:

**Manova for Responsiveness-Cherishing Bartlett Factor Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Leader</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Code</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANOVA for Restrictiveness-Containment Bartlett Factor Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Leader</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.284</td>
<td>2.046</td>
<td>0.076*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Code</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>2.359</td>
<td>0.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANOVA for Restrictiveness-Intradependence Bartlett Factor Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.196</td>
<td>4.177</td>
<td>0.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Leader</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Code</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.013</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.810</td>
<td>1.455</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes significance at the $p < 0.05$ groupwise alpha level.
Table 10. Posthoc Contrasts for Bartlett Factor Scores

Contrasts for Restrictiveness-Containment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>LSD Posthoc Contrast</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other male relative &gt; Father</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other male relative &gt; Mother</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other male relative &gt; Both parents</td>
<td>1.890</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other female relative &gt; Mother</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other female relative &gt; Both parents</td>
<td>2.016</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None &gt; University</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic &gt; Junior Secondary</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic &gt; Secondary</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>&gt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic &gt; Trade/Vocational</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic &gt; University</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>&gt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary &gt; University</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Vocational &gt; University</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrasts for Restrictiveness-Intradependence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>t-statistic contrast</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>North &gt; South</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>&gt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Correlations of Bartlett Scores and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Responsiveness-Cherishing</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restrictiveness-Containment</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.221*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Restrictiveness-Intradepen</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age of parent</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.170*</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No. of children</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.158t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Childrens’ mean age</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.113t</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parent age at first child</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes significance at the p < 0.004 alpha level.

t denotes a trend nearing significance p<0.05 alpha level.

older parents. The average age of each participants’ children showed a trending
correlation with Responsiveness-Cherishing, such that parents of older children scored
higher on this factor, but this trend of not significant at the corrected groupwise alpha
level (r = -0.113, p <0.05).
Restrictiveness-Containment

Several demographic features of participants were related to this factor score. The person identified as the leader of the household impacted scores on Restrictiveness-Containment, such that households led by both parents scored the lowest on this variable, followed by mothers, fathers, other male relative, and other female relative. If the leader of the household was another female relative, other than the mother of the children in consideration for the CRPR, then the participant scored significantly higher on this factor than if the household leader was the children’s mother or both parents jointly, but scores were not significantly higher than if the household leader was the father (see Table 10). If the household leader was another male relative, parents scored higher on Restrictiveness-Containment than if the leader of the household was the children’s mother, father, or both parents. To summarize, there were significant differences on this factor between households led by mothers or both parents, than when another relative (presumably an elder) was in charge; households led by fathers or other female relatives were not significantly different, but other male relatives were higher on this factor than fathers.

Mothers’ level of education was also significantly related to Restrictiveness-Containment scores. In families with a university educated mother, participants scored significantly lower on this factor than participants who reported mother’s highest level of education as less than junior secondary school, but there was no significant difference between families with university educated mothers and those who completed secondary school. Participants who reported that mother’s highest education completed was basic
(i.e., elementary) school scored significantly higher on Restrictiveness-Containment than all other categories of educational achievement, except for those who reported no formal schooling. If the participant reported that the mother had no formal schooling, factor scores were significantly higher than families with university educated mothers, but there were no differences with other levels of education and no formal schooling (see Table 10).

**Restrictiveness-Intradependence**

Location was strongly associated to scores on this factor. Participants in the northern city of Tamale scored significantly higher ($p < 0.0001$) on Restrictiveness-Intradependence (mean = 0.379) than parents in the southern city of Accra (-0.128). The mean difference between these two groups was 0.507, or half of one standard deviation difference.

**Interview Correlates**

Analyses were conducted to determine if any of the response themes from the qualitative parent interviews were associated with Bartlett factor scores for Responsiveness-Cherishing, Restrictiveness-Containment, and Restrictiveness-Intradependence. The sample size was limited to the 26 usable interview participants, and three were excluded from these analyses because their identification numbers were unclear and could not be linked to that participant’s CRPR data. Given the small sample
size (n=23), the Mann-Whitney $U$ test was utilized to compare the factor scores of those subjects who did or did not endorse the modal thematic codes in each interview question.

Results demonstrated significant differences in the Restrictiveness-Containment Bartlett factor scores for two of the tested thematic codes. On a question about generational differences between parenting today and when the participants were children, 37% of parents described increased levels of communication with their children, compared to a generation ago. The median latency for those who endorsed a theme of increased communication between parents and children was -1.087, and for parents who did not mention increased communication the median latency was 0.265, Mann–Whitney $U = 74$, $n_1 = 11$, $n_2 = 12$, $p < 0.05$ two-tailed. This result demonstrates that parents who described increased communication with their own children as compared to the way they were raised tended to score lower on the Bartlett score for Restrictiveness-Containment.

On a question about intercultural research by Americans in Ghana, 37% of participants expressed a need for foreign researchers to be aware of cultural attitudes and beliefs of Ghanaians. This result was negatively associated with the Restrictiveness-Containment factor. The median latency for those who described a need for awareness of cultural attitudes was -1.113, and the median latency for participants who did not describe this theme was 0.181, Mann–Whitney $U = 51$, $n_1 = 10$, $n_2 = 13$, $p < 0.05$ two-tailed. Participants who described concern about foreign researchers’ awareness of cultural attitudes scored significantly lower on the Bartlett score for Restrictiveness-Containment.
Ancillary Analyses Summary

In sum, several demographic variables were significantly associated with the Bartlett scores for the Responsiveness-Cherishing, Restrictiveness-Containment, and Restrictiveness-Intradependence factors. Most significant correlations were modest in magnitude, $r = 0.170$. Only the Restrictiveness-Containment factor scores were associated with differences on qualitative interview themes, and this factor was inversely related to increased communication with children and desire for researchers to gain awareness of cultural attitudes. In the Discussion section, the meaning of these results and associations with the extant literature will be addressed.
CHAPTER V:
DISCUSSION

The discussion is divided into four main sections. First, the major findings from the quantitative CRPR data and qualitative parent interviews are synthesized and their implications for studying parenting are presented. Second, the implications of the ancillary findings related to urban diversity, secular changes over time, and participants’ advice to the experimenter are discussed. The third section discusses the limitations of this study. Specifically, weaknesses of the study sample, limitations at the design level, and restrictions on interpretative results are addressed. The fourth and final section contains some recommendations to improve future intercultural research and research on parenting programs in Ghana.

Major Findings

A Unique Factor Structure of Urban Ghanaian Parenting

As predicted, a unique factor structure emerged in the present study describing parenting practices in urban Ghanaians. The three factors that emerged were Responsiveness-Cherishing, Restrictiveness-Containment, and Restrictiveness-Intradependence. The findings of this study represent the first scientific reconfiguration of parenting styles in Africa, and demonstrate that parenting practices in urban Ghana are significantly different from parenting styles constructed upon theory and research studies.
in the United States. While it is widely accepted that culture and context impact parenting practices, this is the first research to demonstrate the details of such practices and to propose a new model for understanding parenting in Ghana.

The Ghanaian parenting practices model was derived from exploratory factor analysis of the Child Rearing Practices Report and qualitative interviews. Before attempting to construct a new model, the Ghanaian parents’ CRPR responses were tested through structural equation modeling to determine if previously published models from India, China, and the United States fit the current sample. Results showed that conservative goodness of fit indices (based on the chi-square statistic) demonstrated that these models were significantly different from the true latent structure of the Ghanaian data. Interestingly, these models demonstrated reasonably good fit based on each international model’s factor related to parental responsiveness, nurturance, and acceptance of the child. Thus, in part, the Ghanaian data replicated findings from previous research that have shown that expression of parental love and acceptance is present in several cultures, and manifests in similar ways across these cultures (Barber & Olsen, 2005; Bradford et al., 2003; Ceballo et al., 2008; Hill & Tyson, 2008; Rao et al., 2005; Rohner & Britner, 2002; Schaefer, 1965).

In contrast, the Ghanaian CRPR items demonstrated several insignificant loadings on the factor in each published model related to parental rejection and restrictiveness. Moreover, the items included on the Authoritarianism scale (Rao et al., 2005) and the Restrictiveness scale (Rickel & Biasetti, 1982) were highly inconsistent. This difference
seems to explain the mixed results for chi-square and unbiased fit indices when the published models were applied to the Ghanaian sample. In other words, previously published models are a good fit for one underlying factor, corresponding to responsiveness, nurturance, and acceptance, but not for another factor, related to restrictiveness and rejection.

Detailed examination of the exploratory factor analysis provides additional evidence that many aspects of parental responsiveness apply to many cultures, whereas features of parental restrictiveness are more culturally specific. The previously published factors related to restrictiveness or parental control contained several mismatched items compared to the newly derived Restrictiveness-Containment and Restrictiveness-Intradependence variables from the Ghanaian data. Even when the two Ghanaian restrictiveness factors were combined, several highly loading items on these factors were absent from the previously published factors, and many items from the published factors were omitted. According to this study, features of urban Ghanaian parenting related to restrictiveness are expressed with greater cultural specificity, and ancillary analyses suggest that restrictiveness manifests in different ways within the sample, based on various contextual and cultural factors.

Many studies have uncovered varying restrictiveness variables related to cross-cultural comparisons from the CRPR items in Europe, North America, and Asia (Barton et al., 1977; Roberts, 1999; Roberts, Block, & Block, 1984; Rudy & Grusec, 2001), demonstrating that restrictiveness variables have different manifestations across dissimilar cultures. (Dekovic et al., 1991; Rao et al., 2005). Thus, the results of the
current study are a logical extension of the extant literature on intercultural parenting research. The unique CRPR items loading on the Restrictiveness-Containment and Restrictiveness-Intradependence factors indicate the presence of culturally specific features of parenting in Ghana, and the need for further research.

The following section expands and explains the patterns of parenting styles that emerged in the CRPR factor analysis, and is intended to provide a starting point for further research and revision of these parenting factors. Comparisons with other published parenting styles from various groups around the world are drawn to provide links to research on common principles, as well as contrasts and specific features of this sample of parents, in this particular socio-political location and time. These factors are not intended to be the final word on urban Ghanaian parenting styles, but rather a starting point for continuing research and discussion.

**Exploration of the Ghanaian CRPR factors**

**Responsiveness-Cherishing**

Although many items in the Responsiveness-Cherishing factor overlapped with items in the equivalent factors from other populations, several items on the Responsiveness-Cherishing factor extend beyond the previously proposed constructs of responsiveness (Rao et al., 2005; Rickel and Biasetti, 1982), warmth (Le et al., 2008; McLloyd et al., 2002), or love and acceptance (Rohner & Britner, 2002). The exploratory factor analysis revealed that several additional items in the current data loaded onto the same factor, which accounted for the addendum of the term *cherishing*. 
These included encouragement of a child’s individual achievement, detailed attention to the child’s bodily needs, parental self-sacrifice, and taking pleasure from interacting with children.

**A New Generation of Parents**

Younger parents were significantly more likely to strongly endorse the Responsiveness-Cherishing pattern, which is aligned with anecdotal evidence that young, urban parents in Ghana are more likely to access more liberal ideas through various means, while older parents tend to ascribe to more traditional, conservative values. The interview sample was too small to calculate age associations adequately, but qualitative responses demonstrated that several young parents strongly ascribed to the Responsiveness-Cherishing pattern. These parents tended to have formal education and a skilled or professional job, and often described technology, books, and media as a resource for information on parenting.

**Impact of Religion: A Loving God**

Interview data confirmed that religious communities have been a powerful force of social change with regards to parenting. Almost all of the parents interviewed described their church or mosque as an influence on parenting, and many explained that religious services have encouraged them to listen more to their children and express more affection, both features of the Responsiveness-Cherishing parenting factor. This finding seems to reflect an explosion in popularity of Pentacostal and Charismatic churches in
Ghana within the past three decades, which emphasize self-examination, spiritual renewal, and expression of traditional cultural beliefs. These faiths emphasize a loving image of Christ and teach parents to show emotional support to children, particularly through parables in which a weaker person overcomes a more powerful force through God (Asamoah-Gyadu, 2007; Clarke, 2006). Although only some of the interviewees reported their church as Pentacostal or Charismatic, the movement of these denominations seems to have had widespread effects on religious culture across denominations and faiths (Clarke, 2006). The message of loving one’s children through one’s relationship with God, and the rapid conversion and growth of Ghana’s Charismatic and Pentacostal churches, also fits with the finding from interviews that many parents endorsing Responsiveness-Cherishing features of child-rearing explained that their own parents treated them much more harshly. In fact, the shift in socio-political psyche towards democratic horizontal individualism (Singelis et al., 1995) and the increase in personal religious philosophy since the 2000 presidential election in Ghana (Gifford, 2004) represent the perfect storm, so to speak, for a rise in Responsiveness-Cherishing parenting style.

**Cherishing features**

With respect to parenting styles based upon the intersecting vectors of responsiveness and demandingness (Baumrind, 1967; Maccoby, 1994), the items on Responsiveness-Cherishing seem to align with elevated parental responsiveness and demandingness. This combination defines Baumrind’s definition of authoritative
parenting style, which has been promoted by mental health professionals as the most beneficial parenting approach. However, the Responsiveness-Cherishing factor seems to include a qualitatively different type of demandingness than originally intended in Baumrind’s authoritative style. For example, in Baumrind’s styles, as well as many studies in North American and European cultures, psychological control through guilt or pressure is associated with the demandingness of authoritarian parenting and negative youth mental health (Bradford et al., 2003; Dwairy, 2010). Yet in the current study, the use of guilt and pressure for achievement loaded on the Responsiveness-Cherishing factor.

Items on the Responsiveness-Cherishing factor indicate high acceptance, but in the context of parental expectations that the child will uphold certain responsibilities. This may be linked to the intergenerational features of Ghanaian families, in which adults care for both the young and the elderly. While the Responsiveness-Cherishing factor is the most liberal parenting style manifested in the current sample, it may be more conservative than Euro-American parenting styles by necessity. Retirement homes, which proliferate in North America and Western Europe, are non-existent in Ghana, and there is a strong premium on family to provide the highest quality caretaking (Mate-Kole, 2008). Parents, even those who highly endorse emotional responsiveness and support, may be more prone to limit children’s freedom, in order to build security for the future. Thus, the addendum Cherishing seemed especially apt, given its etymology from the Latin “carus,” meaning “dear, beloved, costly” (Oxford English Dictionary, 2011). Responsiveness-Cherishing captures parental acceptance and enjoyment of children, as
well as the collectivistic values parents practice and instill in their children to improve outcomes in future years.

Restrictiveness-Containment

Of the 15 items that loaded onto the Restrictiveness-Containment factor, 6 overlapped with the restrictiveness factor which is present in European and North American samples (Rickel & Biasetti, 1982; Rudy & Grusec, 2006). The overlapping items included themes of restrictions on children’s behavior, suppressed emotional expression, and low freedom of expression for children. These items fit the pattern of an authoritarian parenting style (Baumrind, 1967; Maccoby, 1994) which is associated with negative youth outcomes in families of European heritage, and shares many attributes with the predominate forms of parenting in African American, Asian American, Latino, and other cultural minority groups in the United States (Barry et al., 2010; Chao, 1994; Le et al., 2008; McLoyd, 2002), as well as authoritarian parenting styles in various Asian, Arab, and African countries (Dwairy, 2010; Lai et al., 2000; Liu & Guo, 2010; Ocansey, 2004; Stewart et al., 1999). However, the Restrictiveness-Containment factor in the current study was missing 11 of the items on Rickel & Biasetti’s (1982) Restrictiveness scale and 3 items from Rao et al.’s (2003) Authoritarian Practices scale, that included several items that refer to harsh discipline, conservative sexual attitudes, restrictions on toileting, and parental domination of the child in conflict.
Disciplinary Practices

The omission of harsh discipline practices from Restrictiveness-Containment, and all of the other Ghanaian factors for that matter, is particularly interesting given that intercultural research describes greater endorsement and culturally grounded practices of corporal punishment in families of color than whites in the United States and Europe (Deater-Deckard et al., 1996; McLoyd, 2007; Payne, 2003). However, when taken together with the results of the qualitative parent interviews, descriptions of physical discipline were invariably coupled with a verbal lecture or explanation of the parent’s rationale for meting out such punishment. It is possible that the item on the CRPR, “I believe physical punishment to be the best way of disciplining,” was not endorsed because it was worded to exclusion of a verbal exchange between parent and child. Parents in the current study often described a hierarchy of verbal warnings and punishments, culminating in corporal punishment only after other methods were exhausted.

Sexual Attitudes

The Restrictiveness-Containment also excluded items related to parents’ negative attitudes regarding children’s questions about sex, and gender-typing toys or activities. These items were not included in the Chinese or Indian derived scales (Rao et al., 2005), but three items related to sex or gender were included on the American restrictiveness scale (Rickel & Biasetti, 1982). The stronger emphasis on controlling sexual knowledge in the American restrictiveness scale may be due to cultural or generational influences,
given the time lag between studies. In the early 1980s, the United States was emerging from the sexual revolution, but not all members of society agreed with the liberalization of sexual mores. Simultaneously, the Reagan conservative movement was growing, and parents in the Rickel & Biasetti (1982) study who endorsed general restrictiveness may have been apt to also endorse conservative sexual attitudes, including negative feelings about discussing sex or children seeing one another’s bodies. In the years since this study, no published study has assessed the psychometric properties of Rickel & Biasetti’s scales in an American population, and it is possible that these items might not hold the same salience for parents today as they did in the 1980s.

While contextual and cultural factors may have increased the likelihood of negative attitudes towards sexual expression in the American sample, opposing forces may be related to their absence from the Ghanaian Restrictiveness-Containment factor. In contemporary Ghana, sexual knowledge is increasing in public discourse due to the HIV virus, often in combination with references to morality and religion (Ankomah, 1994; Fiscian, 2009; Ocansey, 2004). In addition to discussion about sex, the item “I do not think children of different sexes should be allowed to see each other naked,” loaded onto the restrictiveness scale in the American sample, but was not included in any of the Ghanaian factors. In the cities, it is acceptable for young children to bathe or dress in view of one another, and in rural areas preadolescent boys may swim or fish (involving diving or digging in riverbanks) without clothes. Personal privacy and modesty play significant roles in Ghanaian society, dress, and religious beliefs, but nakedness in young children does not carry the same taboo as it does in American culture. Interestingly, Rao
et al.’s (2005) authoritarian practices scale did not include any items related to sex or gender. The presence of these items in the American restrictiveness scale may be more closely related to American sexual conservatism than to liberalism among Ghanaians, Chinese, or Indians who endorse restrictive parenting practices.

**Toilet Training**

Surprisingly, the CRPR item related to early toilet training was not significantly related to Restrictiveness-Containment. This finding was unexpected because observations by the primary investigator and anecdotal reports indicated that in general, Ghanaian children begin toilet training as soon as they can walk. It was expected that the Restrictiveness-Containment factor would be associated with a desire for early toilet training, as is its counterpart in the American sample. Instead, a post-hoc analysis showed that this item was significantly correlated with the Responsiveness-Cherishing factor, and negatively correlated with Restrictiveness-Intradependence, with no relationship to Restrictiveness-Containment. The associations with other factors were not strong enough for the item to load onto any factor in this model, but it raises an interesting question about the meaning of early toilet training. In European heritage groups, toilet training is associated with properly separating waste from the body, and failure to conform to social prescriptions may result in shame, disgust, or rejection. Early psychoanalysts theorized that poor toilet training could result in personality features that were either too constricted or too loose, and such theory has seeped into popular culture in the forms of colloquial usage of terms such as *anal-retentive personality*. In the CRPR
results of this study, toileting seems to be more meaningfully related to other bodily care that a parent provides, such as monitoring food intake, and is less associated with control than in Euro-American groups.

**Parental Domination**

Lastly, Restrictiveness-Containment did not include items related to domination of the child’s will, as shown in the Rickel & Biasetti’s factors. For families of European heritage, the authoritarian parenting style and restrictive parenting practices tend to correlate with harshness, hostility, aggression, and efforts to dominate the child’s behaviors (Chao, 1994). In the United States, restrictiveness tends to be confounded with harsh, unsupportive parenting in Caucasian families, and manifests as Baumrind’s authoritarian parenting style. Authoritarianism represents high vertical individualism, including competition, acquisition of status, and subjugation of others (Triandis, 1998). In contrast, authoritative parenting is more democratic, and corresponds to high horizontal individualism, which emphasizes equality, individuality, and self-reliance. In contrast, parental restrictiveness in collectivist cultures is interpreted as concerned involvement (Chao, 1994; Rudy & Grusec, 2006). Therefore, Restrictiveness-Containment seems to represent limitation without harshness or aggression.

Aside from missing several items that loaded on restrictiveness factors in other studies, the Restrictiveness-Containment factor included several items that did not appear in other studies. These items related to protecting a child from physical danger, discouraging interpersonal conflict, increasing family unity. The Containment addendum
highlights the protective qualities of parental restriction for children, such that structure imposed by parents serves as an organizing construct for children, rather than an impingement.

Restrictiveness-Intradependence

In the Ghanaian CRPR data, a third factor emerged that accounted for items in the general category of parental restrictiveness, along with items related to both horizontal and vertical collectivist values. The most highly loaded item on this scale was, “I have never caught my child lying,” and all other items were associated with this item. At first glance, this statement may seem like a denial of children’s misbehavior, possibly in an attempt to portray socially desirable characteristics, because it is unlikely that a child in any family context has never lied. On the other hand, the CRPR item about lying may have been construed as too narrow, in that many individuals who ascribe to collectivist values view various types of lies differently than people holding individualistic mindsets. Research has demonstrated that in some situations, children from a collectivist background (e.g., urban China) were more likely to lie to protect the group and viewed this type of lying more favorably than lying to protect or promote one’s individual interests (Fu, Evans, Wang, & Lee, 2008). In a follow up study, Sweet, Heyman, Fu, & Lee (2010) demonstrated that such lies were only condoned when transgressions were minor and did not harm others. These results from members of a Chinese collectivist group may shed light on a combination of factors, including a desire to portray one’s community as honest, and a tendency to cover minor indiscretions (such as a child’s
lying) through denial of such facts, that may have contributed to the salience of this particular item to the pattern of Restrictiveness-Intradependence in the Ghanaian sample. Therefore, the item, “I have never caught my child lying,” might represent part of a cluster of collectivist values, and the other items in this factor are associated with this latent belief system. Correlations between these parenting styles and proxy variables for collectivism, such as demographic characteristics, will be discussed below.

**Associations with Parenting Factors**

**Traits and Correlates of Participants**

Overall, the sample in this study represented a diverse swath of urban residents in Ghana and slightly more than half the participants were fathers. This latter statistic differs from most previous parenting research, which has tended to include mothers’ perspectives with far greater frequency than fathers’ views (Phares, 1992; Phares, Feilds, Kamboukos, & Lopez, 2005). This study had the advantage of roughly equal groups of mothers and fathers, allowing gender differences in parenting practices to be assessed for each major analysis.

Most of the respondents lived in the Accra metropolitan area, and about a quarter of participants resided in the city of Tamale. In Ghana, geopolitical differences between the north and south of the country are strongly embedded in identity. In general, the areas along the southern coast of the Atlantic Ocean are more developed, with greater access to education and technology, than the northern arid regions that border the Sahara desert. Such contextual differences need not generate great differences in culture, or
parenting style for that matter, but results should be interpreted with this geographic context in mind. Within each city, religious diversity was more prominent in Tamale (nearly even proportions of religions), while in Accra the Christian majority was representative of the national proportions of Muslims and Christians (16% and 80%, respectively; World Resources Institute, 2006). Traditional religions were absent from this urban sample, likely due to the fact that most people who identify their primary religion as animist and traditional faiths live in rural areas.

One important feature to consider in this study is that the sample was more educated and had higher status occupations than the general population of Ghana. This was not a random sampling of all possible urban Ghanaian parents. While efforts were made to include diversity, the sample is skewed toward individuals with secondary and post-secondary education, working in skilled positions or professional roles. Participants with higher SES may demonstrate aspects of middle-class and upper-class life, which are shared throughout middle class populations the world over, such as relief from dire needs, a worldview that childhood is a distinct and special phase of life, and the belief that academic achievement is a measure of success. They may also have greater access to foreign influences, such as television, radio, books, and magazines, as well as greater proficiency in multiple European languages. Results of this study are mainly representative of Ghanaian middle-class values, and may not accurately represent lower income groups with less education. Several participants in the qualitative interviews referenced having traveled or lived abroad. In some cases, this sample may represent middle class Ghanaians who chose to remain in Ghana for personal or professional
reasons, rather than join the millions of Ghanaian diasporans living and working abroad. Nevertheless, the middle class participants in this sample are representative of a general upward shift in Ghanaian income and standard of living, and their responses provide insight into current trends in parenting practices, in addition to providing a point of comparison to many other studies across the world which tend to include middle and upper class participants (e.g. Lai, Zhang, & Wang, 2000).

Correlations between demographic variables and CRPR factor scores shed light on the typical parent or family that represents each style. Responsiveness-Cherishing factor scores were higher among younger parents. Given the overall education and income level of the current sample, the parents in this study who strongly endorsed Responsiveness-Cherishing items were young, middle class or wealthy, educated professionals. This result is similar to findings in North America and Western Europe, as well as Asia, that indicate young, educated, urban parents tend to identify with more responsive parenting styles than those of lower socioeconomic status (Lai et al., 2000).

The typical parent in this study who strongly endorsed the Restrictiveness-Containment factor was slightly older, less likely to have a university educated mother in the family, and more likely to identify a man or other female relative as the head of the household (as opposed to a mother-led household or both parents leading jointly). The fact that father-led households score higher on Restrictiveness-Containment indicates that this cluster of parenting traits may be more common in men than women, and may indicate gender differences in parenting styles. Although the current sample did not demonstrate significant gender differences on any of the factors, more nuanced features
of gender identity may be related to differences in parental supportiveness or restrictiveness. Interestingly, participants from families led by other female relatives who were not the mothers of children in consideration for the CRPR questions also scored highly on Restrictiveness-Containment. It is possible that households led by non-mothers are more likely to be led by a female relative from the father’s side, such as the father’s mother or aunt. More information is needed to determine in paternal female relatives parenting styles are mediated through fathers, or if women in general are less responsive and more restrictive with children who are not their biological offspring.

The only factor score associated with geographical location was Restrictiveness-Intradependence. Parents from Tamale scored significantly higher on this factor than parents from the south. This finding is not surprising, given that Tamale is remote from foreign influences, less economically and educationally developed, and more rooted in traditional cultures based in surrounding small towns. Interestingly, religion was not associated with scores for Restrictiveness-Intradependence, despite the fact that Tamale and Accra have quite different religious compositions. Location seemed to account for the differences in Restrictiveness-Intradependence, regardless of religion, indicating that traditional cultural family dynamics may be common among peoples from similar locations. Ethnic groups in the Northern Region of Ghana tend to be patriarchal, whereas southern Ghana has greater influence from matriarchal groups such as the Akan (Gocking, 2005). Thus, Christians and Muslims in Tamale seem to have similar family values, and tend to ascribe to higher levels of collectivist traits with respect to parenting.
Qualitative Findings

The qualitative parent interviews provided information on parenting practices and attitudes. Each of the questions covered topics that are included in the CRPR and most other studies of parenting practices (see Hill & Tyson, 2008). Interviews provided additional information that was assessed generally in the CRPR regarding parents’ opinions about parenthood in Ghana, the role that religious beliefs and traditions play in childrearing, and perspectives on discipline.

Defining Parenthood

The results from interview question on the definition of parenting provided general information that may benefit from additional research to fully understand urban attitudes towards parenting in Ghana. In the current study, no additional questions to clarify responses were asked of participants that may have provided more information about the definition of parenting and activities which are not considered parenting. In general, results from this study indicated that anyone who provides for a child’s basic needs and imparts some sort of social values in a child is a parent; however, this is a vague characterization and does not clearly distinguish between parents and other caregivers. It is possible that the role of a parent is not distinguishable from another blood relative, or that the parent is the adult who happens to have the most responsibility for a child at any given time, regardless of bloodlines. In Ghana, connections with relatives and close family friends are an important component in family life, and often have roots in ethnic group associations, particularly in cities. Further research is needed
to examine the definition of parenting, parental obligations, and the boundaries of the parenting role.

Impact of Religion or Faith

Nearly all of the parents interviewed for this study reported that their faith or religion was a strong influence on their parenting style. This finding speaks to the religiosity and spirituality of Ghanaians in general, as well as the increasingly explicit role that religious groups are undertaking in family life. Islam was introduced in Ghana through North African traders entering northern Ghana in the 1300s, and the majority of Ghanaian Muslims follow Sunni traditions. Christianity was promoted by European merchants and colonizers on the southern coast since the 1800s (Clarke, 1997; Gocking, 2005). Both religions have experienced increased growth in the past several decades, while adherents to traditional Ghanaian belief systems have declined in number (World Resources Institute, 2006). Due to socio-political events in the past three decades, churches of the Charismatic, Pentecostal, and African Indigenous Christian traditions have flourished (Clarke, 1997), and Muslim missionary activities within Ghana have grown with support from Wahhabist leaders in the Middle East and internal supporters of mainstream Sunni Islam (Azumah, 2000). On the individual level, both religions have demonstrated an increased emphasis on a person’s relationship with God and with other people, including children. Places of worship commonly provide workshops on parenting, education, financial success, marital life, health and wellness, and various other topics related to life in urban centers (Sefa-Dedeh, 2008). Therefore, it follows that
participants would report strong influences of faith on their parenting practices. In particular, results in this study showed that parents felt their faith or religion helped them to teach children about morals and encouraged them to express caring emotions to their children. The interviews in this study were too general to obtain specific information on the method of encouragement from churches or mosques, or to compare various levels of religious involvement with respect to parenting practices. In general, though, it seems that most parents view their religion as an institution that encourages emotionally supportive and responsive parenting practices. This aligns with research on African American families and religion in the United States (Cain, 2007). This result seems to contrast with research on religiosity in European American families. A meta-analysis of religiosity and family practices revealed that European American parents who endorsed high levels of religious beliefs and practices were more likely to endorse the authoritarian parenting style, as well as the use of corporal punishment (Mahoney, Pargament, Tarakeshwar, & Swank, 2001). However, the authors noted that this meta-analysis was limited to studies of Christian conservatives, and therefore the impact of other types of Christianity and other religions in European American families is not clear. Wilcox (2002) argues that conservative and moderate religions in the United States tend to promote authoritative parenting in families of all ethnic backgrounds, so the relationship between religion and parenting style needs to be re-examined in the United States. One thing is clear: parents in urban Ghana tended to describe their religious affiliation and faith as a source of parental guidance, and this guidance focused on expressing emotional affection towards and supporting the freedom of expression for their children
Attitudes towards Intercultural research: Welcoming, but Watchful

Overall, participants in this study seemed to think that increased research and attention towards family processes in Ghana was a positive development, if that research is executed and interpreted appropriately. The results of Hypothesis 4 summarized the findings to the parent interview item regarding view on an American researcher conducting this sort of research. Responses were coded regarding the content of advice or recommendations expressed by participants, but some responses were not coded in the initial analysis. These included participants who did not offer any advice or stated that they were happy with the research study. In hindsight, the frequency and quality of such responses would have been helpful in gauging recommendations for future research.

Participants who provided specific recommendations or warnings tended to focus on the researcher’s awareness of cultural features of urban Ghana. They stated that researchers should acquire knowledge of cultural attitudes and practices before arriving in Ghana, though books or personal communications with Ghanaians living abroad, and then obtain further training upon arrival in country. Several participants recommended that researchers should keep an open mind in the analysis of data. Their responses highlighted that certain variables or scores on survey measures may not have construct validity in a population that is different from the population in which such measures were created.

One interesting finding related to participants’ views on foreign researchers was a negative correlation between concern for cultural awareness and the Restrictiveness-
Containment Bartlett score. It is possible that parents who strongly endorsed the Restrictiveness-Containment items were less likely to anticipate problems in foreign researchers’ practices and interpretations. On the other hand, they may have been less likely to see increased cultural awareness as a solution to such a problem. Further research is needed to determine why this result occurred.

Limitations

This study represents the first mixed methods psychological research on parenting styles in contemporary urban Ghana. The greatest strength of this project is its careful combination of etic cross-cultural comparative analysis with unique emic descriptive data from the qualitative interviews. The goal of this study was to gain insight into unique features of parenting in urban Ghana, and determine if any published principles of parenting theory apply to the families in this study. Overall, this study was successful in identifying features of parenting reported by the Ghanaian participants that seem to be similar to parenting in a variety of other cultures, as well as capturing combinations of parenting practices and attitudes that seem to be specific to urban Ghanaian culture. While these results are intriguing, several limitations of the study should be considered for interpretation, application, and future research.
Design Limitations

Selection of the Quantitative Measure

The quantitative data in this study was based on the Child Rearing Practices Report, which was designed by American researchers, for the purpose of measuring parenting practices and attitudes among families in the United States (Block, 1965). In the years since the development of the CRPR, it has been used extensively in many populations across North America, Europe, and Asia, demonstrating its use as a universal measurement of parenting features. However, there are clear costs to using a Euro-American research instrument as the basis for study in a cultural group that was not the original target group for the survey. Sellars (1998) and Phinney (1996) have described the benefits and drawbacks of questionnaires in social science research that attempt to measure psychological variables of one cultural group or a heterogeneous mix of cultural groups. A questionnaire or psychological test is most likely to have high validity when it is designed by and for a particular cultural group, and applications outside that group may be misinterpreted or incomplete (Sellars, 1998). On the other hand, the universalist approach holds that some features of human interactions are common across cultures, and may be assessed by etic measures when they are applied conscientiously (Phinney, 1996).

The current study represents the crux of this debate between etic and emic measurement strategies; the objectives of this study were to investigate unique features of urban Ghanaian parenting, as well as compare and contrast features of parenting in other cultures. By using a Euro-American questionnaire, this research is limited by items that were considered relevant to parenting in the United States. The potential shortfalls of
using the CRPR are that the questionnaire items may inappropriately favor distribution to American parenting norms, and may be missing important information about parenting in Ghana. For example, the highest loading item on Restrictiveness-Intradependence (*I have never caught my child lying*) may be a proxy for wide ranging collectivist values, which are not specifically assessed by the CRPR.

The decision to use a questionnaire developed in another culture not only rested on theoretical considerations, but also was practical in that no questionnaire currently exists that was developed by or for Ghanaian parents. Therefore, selection of a foreign questionnaire was essential to meet the objective of collecting quantitative data. However, other considerations were taken into account, such as which questionnaire, by which researchers, tested in which populations, would be most appropriate for use in this study. The CRPR was selected based upon its ease of administration, diverse usage, convergent validity with other features of family processes, and availability of SEM-comparable data. It is by no means a complete inventory of all possible parenting practices, and the current study was not designed to test its psychometric properties in a Ghanaian population. The CRPR in this research was intended to be a starting point for assessment of parenting practices. Further studies on this topic would benefit from reanalysis of the present sample for psychometric applicability, and development of additional CRPR items or an original Ghanaian parenting practices questionnaire that could access features of parenting in Ghana that are not assessed here. For example, data from the qualitative interviews in this study could be re-examined for the purpose of coding parenting practices that are not specifically assessed in the CRPR, and a new
interview could be developed based on this thematic analysis. It would be useful to interview Ghanaian parents who have not completed the CRPR to determine how they define parenting practices in their own words. Likewise, construct validity would be improved by obtaining suggestions for items from Ghanaian psychologists. Finally, questionnaires and interviews are self-report, and therefore more accurately measure attitudes than actual parenting behaviors. Continuing research on parenting practices should include observational study of parents and children, either in their homes or in a research setting. A laboratory setting would allow for researchers to devise interactive situations for parents and children, while observation in the home would provide greater external validity regarding families’ actual daily experiences (Haynes, 1995).

**Interview Limitations**

The questions in the present interview were intended to gather a wide range of open-ended responses to basic features of parenting. While the interviews seemed to be successful in this regard, the depth of information was not sufficient to form a comprehensive assessment of these areas. Follow up questions would have been highly beneficial in clarifying, for example, the types, methods, and rationales related to various types of disciplinary practices. The interviews in the current study offered a glimpse at the deeper research that could be pursued in these areas, and each question could be developed into a full research study. For example, the question regarding parental responses to children’s misbehavior could include follow up questions to probe for each of the themes coded in this study, including physical discipline with or without rationale,
invocation of religion, lecture, removal of privileges, providing rewards, negotiation, and expressing anger. Each of the interview questions could be subjected to the same treatment, with follow up questions probing for the thematic codes found in the current study. This process would provide greater detail regarding parental attitudes towards each thematic response, and greater structure to assess for such responses in all parents, not just spontaneous responses.

The second limitation of the interviews was that information gathered did not directly abet the process of interpreting the quantitative data. In the design phase of this study, some interview questions were considered that would specifically address areas that the CRPR might have neglected to assess, but these questions were later deemed to be too leading and the research design was altered a bit to provide the greatest opportunity for open-ended responses. Future research would benefit from incorporating more detailed follow up questions related to collective co-parenting, family values related to one’s ethnic group traditions, parenting via technological means, and attitudes regarding housekeepers or other hired non-family caregivers, among other topics. The present study did not include interview questions that directly demonstrate the need for modifications to the CRPR or the development of a new parenting practices measure, but instead the qualitative interviews offered a starting point for such research in the future. In particular, it would be useful to reframe the highest loading items for Responsiveness-Cherishing, Restrictiveness-Containment, and Restrictiveness-Intradependence, into open-ended interview questions, to elicit greater depth of information about these items, to elicit related topics that might not be included in the current CRPR items.
Intercultural Limitations

Research associates from the University of Ghana provided essential guidance on methods and implementation of this study. Before data collection, research associates edited the wording of particular phrases to ensure clarity and appropriate terminology because the primary investigator encouraged the Ghanaian associates to clarify any potentially confusing or inappropriate items. These associates did suggest avoiding some potentially serious cultural insensitivities and clarifying the meaning of some phrases. For example, in the initial draft of the demographic form, participants were asked to identify their “tribe,” which was a translated term that had been obtained from Ghanaian-Americans living in the United States. Research associates quickly pointed out that the currently acceptable term in Ghana is “ethnic group,” and all research forms were replaced with this wording. This example highlights the need for multiple levels of collaboration in intercultural research: the term tribe, which Ghanaian-Americans adopted to differentiate from American ethnic groups (i.e., African-American, Latino/a, Caucasian, Asian, etc.) is considered pejorative among Ghanaians. In hindsight, this situation appears obvious, but in the design phase of the study, the primary investigator had accepted the term recommended by Ghanaian-American associates in the United States, and did not realize the error until it was discovered by research associates in Ghana.

As another example, a research associate collecting data in Tamale remarked that the Twi phrase “Meda Wa’ase,” meaning thank you, was not appropriate for questionnaires in the Northern region because Twi is commonly spoken only in the south,
but not in the north. Additionally, a CRPR item regarding children playing outdoors was essentially irrelevant, due to the architecture style of compound houses that prevails in the north.

In most situations, the primary investigator sought consent and collected data with the assistance of a Ghanaian research associate or with the close assistance of a religious leader. At times, four of the research associates collected data without the primary investigator, either alone or in pairs. In this study, records were not kept regarding the administrator of each questionnaire, and therefore it was not possible to compare whether researcher characteristics, including gender, age, or the presence of the primary investigator, impacted results. This limitation could be avoided in the future by simply keeping notes of the circumstances of data collection for each participant.

Sample Restrictions

Sampling Method

Although the present sample represented a wide range of parents from across Accra and Tamale, the sampling method was limited by the primary investigator’s cultural background, knowledge of communities, and concerns about coerciveness. Researchers in Ghana face difficulties in obtaining a random sample. Common methods of obtaining random samples in the United States include random phone dialing, postal mail recruitment, and access to participants through government agencies or schools. In Ghana, several of these methods are unavailable or compromised (as described in the Methods section). Instead, Ghanaian researchers tend to gather random samples through
door-to-door house visits. This approach posed several practical problems for the primary investigator.

First, cultural considerations indicated that the presence of a white, female, foreign researcher arriving unannounced at one’s door, even if accompanied by a Ghanaian researcher, could heighten a variety of expectations, from feeling coerced into participation, to an expectation of reimbursement beyond the researcher’s means to pay. Also, prospective participants could be surprised by the appearance of the researcher and might wish to consult with others in their family or community before agreeing to participate, but might feel compelled to acquiesce on the spot. Third, the primary investigator was not a native of Ghana and had not lived in Ghana before this study commenced, and therefore lacked the necessary knowledge to make spontaneous judgments about the appropriateness, safety, or potential impingements of door-to-door sampling, even with the excellent guidance of local researchers. Greater time, training, and resources might have made such random sampling possible, but these were not available for the present study.

One benefit of random sampling would have been greater demographic representation of economic and educational diversity. While efforts were made to access participants in a variety of community gathering points, greater methodological rigor could have achieved more diversity through stratified sampling. Increased planning and coordination with Ghanaian research associates could improve sampling stratification.
Sample Size

An a priori power analysis determined that approximately 300 participants would be sufficient for an exploratory factor analysis, as well as confirmatory factor analysis with under 25 items. However, some of the SEM models tested included more variables. While sample size was sufficient to test reasonable goodness of fit, a much larger sample (approximately 1500) would be required to test the chi-square indices for the models in this sample. In addition, the findings of this study would be more generalizable if they were based on a greater size sample, as well as more representative of the diversity within Ghanaian cities.

Sample Locations

For similar reasons to the non-random sampling, qualitative interviews were only conducted in Accra. These interviews were conducted by the primary investigator and one research associate (E. Malm). Survey sampling in Tamale was fortuitously made possible by another research associate (M. Alhassan) and was completed within the period of one month, whereas sampling in Accra was occurred over an eight month period. Greater resources and advance planning could have facilitated interview data collection in the north, and should be pursued in future research.

Only two major cities were included in the present study, representing two of the ten regions of the country. Accra, the capital city, is by far the largest urban area in Ghana. Tamale is third largest, and the only large city in the northern part of the country. As Ghanaians generally see a cultural divide between the north and south, the contrast of
these two cities was suitable for the present study. However, it would behoove future researchers on family practices in Ghana to include samples from other regions, especially Kumasi, which is the second largest city and is situated in the Ashante region, within which several matriarchal ethnic groups reside, who could provide different perspectives on urban Ghanaian parenting.

Language Limitations

Although the written questionnaires were available (in written and spoken format) in Twi, all participants opted to use the English format. Participants were not directly asked about their choice of language format, and therefore explanations for this result are speculative. It appeared that participants were comfortable either reading or listening to a research associate speak the questionnaire, and simply asking for clarification on any phrases that were linguistically confusing. The benefit of this method of ad hoc clarification was greater comfort and comprehension by participants. However, clarifications were not necessarily standardized, and data on clarifications were not recorded due to the cumbersome nature of such a task. In future research, it would be beneficial to keep track of CRPR items that require additional clarification. This information might provide ideas about modification or addition of items related to Ghanaian parenting practices.
Interpretive Limitations

The greatest limitation on the current findings of a new model of parenting factors for urban Ghanaian families is that this research is, inherently, an outsider’s attempt to capturing a potentially unique cultural phenomenon. The primary investigator was limited by the fact of her own cultural imprint on this study. The very approach, through the scientific method, to quantify and categorize features of urban Ghanaian parenting, is a product of the primary investigator’s contemporary American context and culture. Despite attempts to engage emic constructs, the etic nature of social science research marks the interpretation of these results as a partial explanation of parenting in Ghana. The objectivity of the investigator is incomplete, and while the subjective impressions are subdued, a kind of intersubjective third has emerged in these results that is not a product of a Euro-American worldview, but also not a fully Ghanaian perspective either.

The generation of three new categories of parenting constructs, responsiveness-cherishing, restrictiveness-containment, and restrictiveness-intradependence are limited by the investigator’s subjective experience of the exploratory factor analysis. A researcher from a different background might look at the same statistical results and see a different meaning in the groupings of items. The terms selected to describe these categories are characteristic of the primary investigator’s training and background. Therefore, while they represent a significant step towards construct validity, they are only the beginning. Many ways of knowing must converge, including psychological studies, as well as other methods of seeking truth, to gain greater understanding into the constructs that make up urban Ghanaian parenting practices. It is quite possible that
Ghanaian parents and psychological researchers will rename and revise the factors identified in this study. Likely, other words exist, perhaps in indigenous languages, that describe the integral aspects of parenting more precisely than these terms. The concept of parenting itself may be less relevant for some Ghanaian families than child-rearing by extended relatives, and this too begs for inquiry. For now, this research has accomplished one step towards knowing, with the awareness that many other possibilities are ripe for exploration.

Given the domain of this particular study, several other interpretive limitations require attention. First, results of exploratory factor analyses always require replication before they may be generalized to a population (Costello & Osbourne, 2005). The new model of Ghanaian parenting constructs must be confirmed or revised through another sample of urban Ghanaian parents who complete the CRPR. Next, it was difficult in this study to draw correlations between interview data and CRPR factor scores for several reasons. Only a small portion of the total participants were interviewed (approximately 10%), and interviewees were only drawn from the sample in Accra. Interviews with more parents and with parents from Tamale would likely improve the strength of correlations between the CRPR findings and interview responses, and illuminate associations that were not apparent in this data.

Finally, this study was intended to observe parenting practices in urban Ghana, but it did not explore the causal factors for such practices. From the current data, it is not possible to fully disentangle factors of ethnicity, culture, and religion, from sociopolitical context (Cauce, 2008). The findings reported here describe parenting practices in a
specific place and time. It is not possible to conclude that the results are the product of
cultural traditions alone. Causal influences, such as cultural and ethnic identity,
socioeconomic status, political family history, and religious connection, are not measured
in this research.

**Benefits and Costs of Using a New Factor Structure**

A common criticism of exploratory factor analyses is that the results may not be
replicated in subsequent studies. However the case may be made that there are no
previous studies of parenting practices questionnaires in urban Ghanaian parents, and it
would not be appropriate to apply a factor structure derived from another population. As
stated above, the exploratory nature of the findings necessitate replication in future
studies to confirm the true latent factor structure.

**Future Research**

Replication of New Factors

The findings of this study are largely exploratory. It was shown that existing
models of parenting practices, such as Baumrind’s typologies and cross-cultural models
from India and China, do not adequately explain urban Ghanaian parenting practices.
The new factors uncovered in the Ghanaian sample of Responsiveness-Cherishing,
Restrictiveness-Containment, and Restrictiveness-Intradependence, require replication
and revision in future research. The stability of these factors demands re-testing in the
urban Ghanaian population, to determine if they are valid and reliable descriptors of
parenting constructs, or if other influences are promoting these results. Random sampling is a crucial step to assessing the accuracy of this model, in order to access greater socioeconomic, religious, occupational, and age diversity among the parents. Also, random sampling would ensure that participants are not self-selected on the basis of English language proficiency and comfort level. Parents who prefer another language than English should be included in future research, and interviews in the participants’ mother tongues will provide for richer expression. Such research may support the identification of new factors or new names for the factors found in this study.

Associations between Ghanaian Parenting Practices Model and Other Traits

In addition to replication of the new factor structure reported in this study, future research is needed to understand what contextual and cultural factors are related to parenting practices. This could be accomplished by combining a measure and interview of parenting practices with assessment of identity factors. Some worthy constructs for such research are collectivism-individualism, religiosity, spirituality, ethnic identity, matriarchal and patriarchal identification, and assimilation with global technology. Many parents in the interviews for this study mentioned that family dynamics are changing through technological advances, in that children have greater exposure to positive and negative foreign influences, and families are using cell phones and facebook to maintain relationships. The impact of technology has a special meaning in Ghana because many families have at least one family member living abroad. Many adolescents in Ghana attend boarding school or travel to another region to work. Whereas childhood in the past
prepared youth for separation from family in the teen years, now technology permits closer parental involvement and more frequent contact across geographical distance. Digital advances are changing the landscape of parenting, and the extent of a family’s engagement with such devices may impact parenting style as much as other cultural factors.

Finally, future research is needed to understand the relationships between parenting practices and child outcomes. Many agencies and religious bodies in Ghana wish to implement parent education and training programs, but lack information on effective parenting practices in the urban Ghanaian context (Sefa-Dedeh, 2008). Information on the associations between existing parenting styles and youth outcomes is vital to the development of culturally appropriate parenting interventions. In particular, many of the parents interviewed for this study described using parenting strategies that are different from the way their own parents treated them as children. Once more information is available on effective parenting practices, program evaluations are essential to examine how features of parenting may be shifted in dysfunctional families.

**Conclusion**

The results of this study yield the first findings for an urban Ghanaian parenting practices model, composed of the factors Responsiveness-Cherishing, Restrictiveness-Containment, and Restrictiveness-Intradependence. This finding is significant in that it is the first research-based psychological model of parenting based on an African population; it applies to urban populations instead of a rural community, and it
contributes to a theoretical shift that validates the study of child development in the developing world, especially in contemporary urban communities. Greater awareness of the unique parenting styles in urban Ghana has many potential benefits to communities. Currently, psychologists and parents are expressing the need for parent training to help cope with problem child behaviors (Sefa-Dedeh, 2008). Workshops for parents are common in schools and religious organizations, but little information has been available about the nature of parenting in urban Ghana, and programs tend to be based on ideas disseminated from Europe or North America. An understanding of urban Ghanaian parenting practices and the creation of new terminology to communicate about such issues can be used to enhance existing parenting programs, modify parent training programs for use in Ghana, and identify opportunities for shifts in parenting behaviors to benefit children.

In addition to parent training programs, the results of this study have the potential to benefit behavioral health programs, such as malaria prevention campaigns, HIV/AIDS prevention, and other public health initiatives. Programs such as these often focus on parents to ensure their children engage in healthy behaviors. Greater understanding of parenting approaches may help others who want to include parents in various initiatives.

Intercultural research that examines normal family processes in culturally heterogeneous communities validates diversity and is open to discovering useful or unique alternatives in parenting practices. Currently, Ghanaian university courses in psychology teach from American or British textbooks, and professors express to their students that the applicability of such information to Ghanaian populations is unknown
(Mate-Kole, 2008), because there is not enough basic research about normal psychological processes in Ghana. This study represents one perspective on urban Ghanaian parenting that contributes to the growing body of research on daily life in Ghanaian cities.

Of course, this model of Ghanaian parenting practices is only the beginning in the study of family life in contemporary Ghana and, for that matter, urban Africa. Future research is needed to confirm if the parenting factors of Responsiveness-Cherishing, Restrictiveness-Containment, and Restrictiveness-Intradependence are the most appropriate terms for describing urban Ghanaian parenting styles, if features should be added or deleted from these categories, and if any other distinct parenting styles exist that were not assessed in this study. Therefore, convergent results from many studies which replicate and refine different results are needed to gain greater understanding of urban Ghanaian parenting practices. Additionally, obtained constructs should be tested in association with multiple child outcomes, such as physical and emotional health, vocational success, and measures of well-being, to determine how parenting practices are related to youth development in Ghana. Finally, research evaluations of parenting programs, aimed at changing parenting practices to improve youth outcomes, can build upon this dissertation to understand how shifts in parenting styles can best support the next generation of urban Ghanaians as they grow and develop.
APPENDIX A:

BLOCK CHILD-REARING PRACTICES REPORT
Child-Rearing Practices Report

For the items below, write the number for how well it describes you.

1. I respect my child’s opinions and encourage him/her to express them.
2. I encourage my child always to do his/her best.
3. I put the wishes of my mate (spouse) before the wishes of my child.
4. I help my child when s/he is being teased by his/her friends.
5. I often feel angry with my child.
6. If my child gets into trouble, I expect him/her to handle the problem mostly by himself/herself.
7. I punish my child by putting him/her off somewhere by himself/herself for a while.
8. I watch closely what my child eats and when s/he eats.
9. I don’t think young children of different sexes should be allowed to see each other naked.
10. I wish my spouse were more interested in our children.
11. I feel a child should be given comfort and understanding when s/he is scared or upset.
12. I try to keep my child away from children or families who have different ideas or values from our own.
13. I try to stop my child from playing rough games or doing things where s/he might get hurt.
14. I believe physical punishment to be the best way of disciplining.
15. I believe that a child should be seen and not heard.
16. I sometimes forget the promises I have made to my child.
17. I think it is good practice for a child to perform in front of others.
18. I express affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child.
19. I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my child.
20. I prefer that my child not try things if there is a chance s/he will fail.
21. I encourage my child to wonder and think about life.
22. I usually take into account my child’s preferences in making plans for the family.
23. I wish my child did not have to grow up so fast.
24. I feel a child should have time to think, daydream, and even loaf sometimes.
25. I find it difficult to punish my child.
26. I let my child make many decisions for him/herself.
27. I do not allow my child to say bad things about his/her teachers.
28. I worry about the bad and sad things that can happen to a child as s/he grows up.
29. I teach my child that in one way or another punishment will find him/her when s/he is bad.
30. I do not blame my child for whatever happens if others ask for trouble.
31. I do not allow my child to get angry with me.
32. I feel my child is a bit of a disappointment to me.
33. I expect a great deal of my child.
34. I am easy going and relaxed with my child.
35. I give up some of my own interested because of my child.
36. I tend to spoil my child.
37. I have never caught my child lying.
38. I talk it over and reason with my child when s/he misbehaves.
39. I trust my child to behave as s/he should, even when I am not with him/her.
40. I joke and play with my child.
41. I give my child a good many duties and family responsibilities.
42. My child and I have warm, intimate times together.
43. I have strict, well-established rules for my child.
44. I think one has to let a child take many chances as s/he grows up and tries new things.
45. I encourage my child to be curious, to explore and question things.
46. I sometimes talk about God and religious ideas in explaining things to my child.
47. I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all the advantages s/he has.
48. I sometimes feel that I am too involved with my child.
49. I believe in toilet training a child as soon as possible.
50. I threaten punishment more often than I actually give it.
51. I believe in praising a child when s/he is good and think it gets better results than punishing him/her when s/he is bad.
52. I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what s/he tries or accomplishes.
53. I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.
54. I believe children should not have secrets from their parents.
55. I teach my child to keep control of his/her feelings at all times.
56. I try to keep my child from fighting.
57. I dread answering my child’s questions about sex.
58. When I am angry with my child, I let him/her know it.
59. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others.
60. I punish my child by taking away a privilege s/he otherwise would have had.
61. I give my child extra privileges when s/he behaves well.
62. I enjoy having the house full of children.
63. I believe that too much affection and tenderness can harm or weaken a child.
64. I believe that scolding and criticism makes my child improve.
65. I believe my child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for him/her.
66. I sometimes tease and make fun of my child.
67. I teach my child that s/he is responsible for what happens to him/her.
68. I worry about the health of my child.
69. There is a good deal of conflict between my child and me.
70. I do not allow my child to question my decisions.
71. I feel that it is good for a child to play competitive games.
72. I like to have some time for myself, away from my child.
73. I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when s/he misbehaves.
74. I want my child to make a good impression on others.
75. I encourage my child to be independent of me.
76. I make sure I know where my child is and what s/he is doing.
77. I think a child should be weaned from the breast or bottle as soon as possible.
78. I instruct my child not to get dirty while s/he is playing.
79. I don’t go out if I have to leave my child with a stranger.
80. I think jealousy and quarreling between brothers and sisters should be punished.
81. I think children must learn early not to cry.
82. I control my child by warning him/her about the bad things that can happen to him/her.
83. I think it is best if the mother, rather than the father, is the one with the most authority over the children.
84. I don’t want my child to be looked upon as different from others.
85. I don’t think children should be given sexual information before they can understand everything.
86. I believe it is very important for a child to play outside and get plenty of fresh air.
87. I get pleasure from seeing my child eating well and enjoying his/her food.
88. I don’t allow my child to tease or play tricks on others.
89. I think it is wrong to insist that young boys and girls have different kinds of toys and play
different sorts of games.
91. I believe it is unwise to let children play a lot by themselves without supervision from grown-ups.
APPENDIX B:

TWO-FACTOR SOLUTION OF THE CHILD-REARING PRACTICES REPORT,

PUBLISHED IN RAO ET AL. (2003)
Authoritative practices

1) I respect my child’s opinions and encourage him/her to express them
2) I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles
3) I let my child make many decisions for him/herself
4) I encourage my child to be curious, explore and question things
5) I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what he tries or accomplishes
6) I am easy going and relaxed with my child
7) I encourage my child to wonder and think about life
8) My child and I have warm, intimate times together
9) I encourage my child to always do his / her best
10) I talk it over and reason with my child when he/she misbehaves
11) I trust my child to behave even when I am not with him/her
12) I want my child to be independent of me

Authoritarian practices

1) I believe that a child should be seen and not heard
2) I teach my child to keep control of his/her feelings at all times
3) I do not allow my child to question my decisions
4) I believe scolding and criticism makes my child improve
5) I have strict well-established rules for my child
6) I believe physical punishment to be the best way of disciplining
7) I believe that too much affection and tenderness can harm or weaken a child
8) I do not allow my child to get angry with me
9) I think children must learn early not to cry
10) I instruct my child not to get dirty when playing
APPENDIX C:

TWO-FACTOR SOLUTION OF THE CHILD-REARING PRACTICES REPORT,

PUBLISHED IN RICKEL & BIASSATTI (1982)
Nurturance:
1. My child and I have warm intimate moments together
2. I encourage my child to talk about his troubles
3. I joke and play with my child
4. I make sure my child knows that I appreciate what he tries to accomplish
5. I encourage my child to wonder and think about life
6. I feel that a child should have time to daydream, think, and even laze around sometimes
7. I express my affection by hugging, kissing, and holding my child
8. I talk it over and reason with my child when he misbehaves
9. I find it interesting and educational to be with my child for long periods
10. I encourage my child to be curious, explore, and question things
11. I find some of my greatest satisfactions in my child
12. When I am angry with my child, I let him know about it
13. I respect my child’s opinion and encourage him to express it
14. I feel that a child should be given comfort and understanding when he is scared or upset
15. I am easygoing and relaxed with my child
16. I trust my child to behave as he should, even when I am not with him
17. I believe in praising a child when he is good and think it gets better results than punishing him when he is bad
18. I usually take into account my child’s preference when making plans for the family.

Restrictiveness:
1. I believe a child should be aware of how much I sacrifice for him
2. I expect my child to be grateful and appreciate all advantages he has
3. I teach my child that in one way or another, punishment will find him when he is bad
4. I teach my child to keep control of his feelings at all times
5. I believe children should not have secrets from their parents
6. I control my child by warning him about the bad things that can happen to him
7. I do not allow my child to say bad things about his teacher
8. I dread answering my child’s questions about sex
9. I believe that scolding and criticism make a child improve
10. I let my child know how ashamed and disappointed I am when he misbehaves
11. I want my child to make a good impression on others
12. I try to keep my child from children or families whose ideas or values are different from our own
13. I think a child should be encouraged to do things better than others
14. I instruct my child not to get dirty when he is playing
15. I don’t want my child to be looked upon as different from others
16. I don’t think that young children of different sexes should be allowed to see each other naked
17. I do not allow my child to question my decisions
18. I believe a child should be seen and not heard
APPENDIX D:

QUALITATIVE PARENT INTERVIEW
Qualitative Parent Interview:

The following questions are topics for a conversation with parents. Questions need not be asked in order or verbatim. Parents should respond freely to the open-ended prompts, with interaction and encouragement by the examiner.

1) We are studying parenting all over the world. What should people know about parenting?
2) How does your faith or religion teach you to treat your child(ren)? Can you tell me a story about this?
3) What do you do when your child misbehaves?
4) How are children who are growing up today different from your generation? How do you handle this in your family?
5) Tell me what is important for American researchers like me to know about coming to Ghana? What do you want us to do? What do you want us not to do?
APPENDIX E:

EXAMPLES OF COMMON RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 1-3
*Question 1: We are studying parenting all over the world. What should people know about parenting?*

Thirteen of the parents’ responses (43%) referenced the parent’s responsibility to a child, without specific examples of this responsibility. This theme was coded if the participant defined a parent as someone who has general responsibility to a child or society, but did not describe what that entails. Some of the responses that exemplify this coded theme are as follows:

Parenting, ahh! It’s a big responsibility. I mean, you should be ready for it, and you should know how to handle your wife, and you should handle your children. I mean, know what to do at what time, and what not to do at what time, so on and so forth. You should be ready for it. It’s not something you just get in because you think it is the normal flow.

I think parenting is basically bringing a child into this world and raising them up to become a responsible adult.

Some parents provided more specific details of the responsibilities, such as preparing children for adult roles (13%). For this response to be coded, the participant must have described explicit aims to prepare a child for adulthood, not just to behave well in the present time. These responses contained some reference to the future.

I believe in our traditional system. When you call someone a parent, it means he has a responsibility that he owes to the child. So if you give birth to a child you have to give the child the necessary training, the upbringing that will help him or mold him to be able to lead a good life that when people see they will know that this person is well-trained.

You are supposed to bring them up to a level, so that when they are a very strong age, they leave you and continue live from there.

People should know how to care for children… and then how you maintain their lives and then become what [they are] to be. And again if you are not there, they can go on to their assumed lives. The world is not
for us. We are in and we pass away someday, somehow. It is our responsibility to teach our children to do good things and to know what is good and what is bad so if we are not there, they can maintain themselves and go on life’s way.

You have to face it. Like for instance, I’ve given beating to a child, and the child is crying. And it’s like, I am shushing the child, “Keep quiet! Do this! Do that!” But so far as I brought the child into the world, she didn’t say to bring her into the world, I brought her into the world so I have to be responsible and take care of every situation that comes in my way.

Even when they go away from you because of age you will still want to find out if there is anything challenging more than for them, then you’d be willing for them to come back so they can have their feedback based on your experience... Guide them the time they are young, and then guide them even after they leave the home, if they care to come back, because there are challenges in life which may be hard on them... So that’s how I understand parenting. Anything happens, they come back to your house, and therefore until death do you part.

Several of the parents (16%) defined parenting as providing basic necessities, such as food, water, shelter, and education, to a child.

I think men should be educated or they should know how to love their children, care about them, provide their needs... provide food... to be there for them in times of trouble. Because you know as kids they’ll have what they want, what they will need they know, so if they will meet them at their desperate needs like that, it makes the going easier for the kids not to push them to the wall, to go outside and ask for help that will make them end up being drug addicts or armed robbers or another sort.

I need to look after them, ensure the education, and ensure that they have good health and enjoy the childhood.

Adults should issue rights in the house. Adults should provide emotional support. Provide for the needs of the child: physical needs, emotional, needs that help them develop cognitively.

A bad parent, I would say to be somebody who doesn’t care. Who wouldn’t mind going in for another woman or another wife, without caring for [the children’s] inconveniences. How much money is in the house?
He wouldn’t care for anything. Only happens when… the child is sick. I’ll tell you, that kind of lifestyle! But the good parent is the one that is caring and always there for the kid.

Two of the parents (7%) specifically referenced biological family relationships as the distinguishing feature of parenting. However, two other parents contradicted this idea.

When we talk about parenting, here in the country, I know then we are talking about blood relations. Either on the mother’s side or father’s side. You can be a parent to your stepchild and you can be a parent to a child who is coming from both parents.

I believe parenting involves one who has given birth to a child and making sure that he brings up the child in the way that he expects the child to go.

Anybody who has a child is a parent. Whether the child is your own or you are a guardian to that child.

As we talk now I have a niece living with me, and I’ve raised her for almost two years. She’s now three, and she knows me as her mother. I’m not stealing her from her parents, but for now, since they are not around in Ghana, that’s it.

Many parents (26%) included in their responses expressing care or loving emotions to children. In fact, almost all of the respondents referenced showing positive emotions towards children, and eight specifically described expressive emotions and demonstrating affection to children.

[Children] should always be able to confide in a good parent. That makes a good parent, to me I think so. A friend. Because if you are not friendly all the time, then the child would be afraid to come to you with their problems.

A good parent is someone who listens to his or her children whenever they speak. A good parent is not someone who, maybe, when the child says
something, shuts the child down. They have to listen to the child and then make a decision out of it.

Faith was referenced in many responses, and two parents (7%) specifically described a parent as someone who imparts their faith traditions to children.

Parenting does not come naturally, and people should learn how to parent well. And the Bible is the best source of learning how to parent a child.

He is responsible for the proper upbringing of the children in a Christian way because for those of us who are Christians, we think that is the proper way that kids to be brought up.

Question 2: How does your faith or religion teach you to treat your child(ren)? Can you tell me a story about this?

The most common responses involved teaching children morals (36%), meaning utilizing faith, religious texts, or religious practices as a way of teaching children correct and incorrect beliefs and behaviors, as in the following:

I try to instill certain values in them by doing the things I read from [a faith-based self-help] book, like how God instructs us to teach our children all the time, anyway, wherever they are, when they are singing, when they are sleeping, when in school and all these things… I try to let them know they have to pray, when they tell lies. I tell them Jesus doesn’t like that. They don’t want to be Satan’s fried because he’s bad and Jesus loves you. You don’t have to tell lies, so you get closer to Him.

First and foremost, my faith teaches me that I should raise the child up the way it should go. Go, so that when it grows up willn’t depart from it. Ok, so what are those ways? Truth, integrity, generosity, I mean we know all the virtues the Bible talks about. So, you teach them alongside the Bible, with stories and examples of people who have done what, and, the result.

Well, you know the African is notoriously religious. I mean, every time you apply religion at one time or the other, so it is difficult to remember something but in almost all ways. Just right now I was telling my daughter that she should be able to take care of her younger sister because
she is the sister and you have to take care of her. It's like being neighborly, they should love, yes, help.

I try to go through the [sermons], and learn about God, about fear of God. I also pray for others, not to hate others. And so on. So, after that you want to try to, as much as possible, alert them whenever they are going wayward, or they do something [wrong], learning. I try to remember that, the more you do that, the child will say, ‘Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, Mommy, this is wrong, I know.’

The second most common response of parents to the question about faith was to describe how their faith or religion teaches them to be more expressive with their love towards their children, either through emotions or physical demonstrations of affection.

Eight parents (26%) provided responses in this category, such as the following.

There are lots of examples in the Bible about what Jesus said about children and how to handle them. So I try as much as possible to use that principle. Basically, to love them, protect them and help them to grow normally.

Christianity is about love, and I think it’s exactly what children need. Children need a lot of love. And I think, hmm, my faith has helped me a great deal in bringing up the children. I extend a great deal of love to them.

Everybody knows that life on the world is so difficult that taking care of the child is not easy. Many times for instance, when the child is hungry, maybe you don’t have money to feed the child... So that little [food] that you have, you give it to the child to eat. Right now you came to me when I was in the kitchen. Some of them have gone to school. This one is sick so he is in the house with me. I am preparing supper, and at the same time think that, ‘Ah! This one is sleeping.’ So I have to prepare another one. So I’m doing this for my kid... I’m preparing soup, I am preparing food on the fire.

In our religion, it teaches us to care for our children, to respect their views, and then to allow them, and then to help them. Yes, like, maybe you have a stubborn child and you decide to starve the child – it’s not good. The Word says we shouldn’t do that.
When I take them to bed, I say ‘Goodnight. Mommy loves you. And who loves you more?’ And they would say, ‘Jesus.’ I’ve always tried to get my children to learn that God loves them more than any human being can do, so that when they are alone, they can seek God for themselves, in their hearts. I’ve also learned that parents should respect their children in order not to frustrate them. And, I feel that this is an important lesson, because I think about my own frustrations as a child, not being able to express myself and so on. And it made me an angry child, so I really believe in communicating with children.

Several parents (16%) commented not only on the values their faith promotes, but also on the importance of imparting faith to their children. Imparting faith was coded as efforts by parents to teach children religion on a spiritual level and instill beliefs, not just behaviors or religious practices.

They should always call on God in terms of crisis, because as they are even young it’s not all they time their parents can be there. Their parents can say I am going to come, and they might not end up coming back. Anything can happen: accidents, death can come at any time, so in times like this you bring your children to be respectful, they should always know God, be fearing, they should always fear God, and know that in times of help or desperation the only person they come to is God.

I didn’t grow up in a situation or an environment where you prayed a lot. I went to church but it was like going to a party on Saturdays. It was just part of my routine. [My husband] has basically pushed the children towards belief. And in so doing, I realized that in order for me to help, I started teaching the Sunday school to learn the doctrine of the Anglican Church. I joined the mothers union. I just get involved in anything and everything with the Anglican Church. So then my children see me as part of that union, or as part of one society. And I think having them in one society it helps our belief.

My family had a very tragic experience, leading to the loss of my brother. And realized that it is not easy to bring up a child, and think that because they come from a Christian home they will be alright. So I use this experience to go by God’s word. Make sure the children know God.
Three of the parents (10%) described teaching children religious practices, but did not explicitly describe imparting beliefs. These practices could be attending services, reading religious texts, joining religious groups or activities, or participating in projects sponsored by the religious organization. Many other participants included comments about religious practices, but often in the context of other themes. The specific practices mentioned were as follows:

If you give birth to a child and you don’t give him the necessary training, that leaves a wound with your religion or your ideology. It may not help the child to be able to go the way you want him or her to go because we have societal values and norms. So if you ask or encourage your child to go to Church, he also lives by the principles of Christ so that he will be able to live a decent life that will be pleasing to you the parents and the society at large.

It teaches us to bring our children up in a God fearing way, with the sense that they should know God. They should always pray before they go to bed, pray before they eat, in terms of everything, prayer should be the first thing.

One parent described how involvement in the Christian faith has encouraged a departure from the previous generation’s parenting practices. This theme, although not specifically coded for other responses, seemed to coincide with some other parents’ views, in that several parents alluded to how joining a religious group (i.e. the Christian church), as opposed to animist traditional religions, has influenced the respondent to treat their children differently than treatment they received from their parents. For example, the response below described how his faith encouraged him to use less severe punishments, which several respondents cited as a result of learning from a church that God loves children and does not like adults to hurt them severely.
By them [people of the church], I just realized that the way that I was treated in those days, when the parents used to [punish harshly]. But now things are changing, so I need to change out of what my parents did that I found out not to be a good thing, try not to not repeat it to my child. So my mom is always proud of me because there are certain things she did that I am not doing.

Question 3: What do you do when your child misbehaves?

Thirteen of the parents (43%) endorsed using physical punishment with a focus on explanations and rationale, or on using physical punishment sparingly:

If I [were to] go deep angry, I would use my hand or something, [and] I would beat\(^1\) the person in the wrong manner. So I won’t risk it. And when I become calm, that one, if I caught you and do another [bad thing], if there’s a stick I’ll give it to you. That’s why it doesn’t stand in the house.

Yes, corporal punishment. I try not to use that. But then I like to talk to them. I mean, maybe raise the voice a bit for you to know that they are not very happy with what he or she has done, and so on and so forth. On rare occasions, you'll want to use the cane. On rare occasions.

When they were younger, umm, I would punish them, often with a smack, because I do believe that children need to be smacked when they go overboard. But I would give them several warnings and I knew not to give warnings without delivering the punishment. So I would do that, and at a very early age, the children knew that my Yay was Yay, and my Nay was Nay. They also learnt how to work with authority.

I believe it is not all the time right for us to use canes because I think you should let the person know the rationale, the wisdom of what you are saying, than to cane the person. But when the need arises that you have to use the cane, you use it mildly so that it will not cause a severe beating to the child.

---

1 The term “beating” is vernacular for any type of physical hitting, spanking, slapping, or even striking with a paddle or belt. It does not carry the same connotation of abusive force as in the United States; rather, beating is often used interchangeably with the word spanking (Ofei-Aboagye, 1994; Sefa-Deddeh, 2008).
One parent referenced a popular American book on child behavior and parenting practices (Phelan, 2010), and explained how he selectively applies physical discipline and the American technique described in this book. This reference reflects the general high educational level of this sample, and the specialized knowledge of this particular participant in child psychology. While the 1-2-3 Magic series does not advocate physical punishment, this parent described engaging the principles of the book with his own preferences.

Occasionally, I, for younger children I would pull your ear. If you hit someone I pull your ear. But after eight years, I don’t think that’s the way. Time out. 1-2-3 Magic: If you’re eight years, eight minutes time out, if you’re ten years, ten minutes time out.

In equal frequency to physical discipline, thirteen parents (43%) in this sample described using lectures as a response to their children’s misbehavior. This theme was coded for responses that described a one-way communication from the parent to the child regarding the misbehavior. Some parents called this a lecture, others simply described it, as follows:

Oh, when a child misbehaves, I normally sit them down and talk to them. I don’t normally beat the child because you have to let the child know why they shouldn’t do such a thing.

I like to talk to them. I mean, maybe raise the voice a bit for you to know that you are not very happy with what he or she has done, and so on and so forth.

I feel continuous talking to with love mostly will solve the problem than spanking the child.
I believe that when a child goes wrong… you need to talk to the child, dissuade the child, let the child understand the reason why it was wrong and by so doing, the child will also appreciate that there will be no need for violence to be visited on him or her. And in a way, it helps the child in the future to be a nonviolent person.

It depends on my emotional state at the time. I realize that we have different kind of culture and upbringing. However, upbringing for me, it’s a little bit noisy. So, compared to other places I have visited, people are much calmer and cooler, and people would address children calmly. Even though we try as much as possible to be calm with our children when they misbehave, one sees themselves screaming and yelling, you know, at times! (laughing) Really!

[Spanking is] not something that I like to encourage, so most usually what I do is I scold them sternly, and let them know that what they are doing is wrong and I don’t like it, and yeah, normally they don’t repeat it.”

Most of the time I let them know. I have always spoken the truth to the children. I let them know how they have done, how it has affected others around them. Mmm, and waited on them to think about it, until they understand that they have to apologize.

Some parents referenced using lectures first, and then employing corporal punishment if the child’s behavior did not improve. Some of these parents also described mixed feelings about using various forms of punishment:

My husband is a teacher, so he uses the cane. I will talk to them. Talk with them.

The first reaction? I will get angry and I will be shouting at you. And then… I am not used to the canes. Sometimes I will threaten them, ‘I am going to beat you.’ If I don’t have the cane, I can give you a knock or something. But I always…I want that to go and have the cane. But sometimes if I have the cane, but I can’t even use it.

One parent who described using lecture admitted that she feels inconsistent with the words she delivers:
Um, the first reaction is usually to shout. Yes, I think I scold them quite a bit. Very rarely [I give harsh punishment], because I, I, my bark is worse than my bite. And I’m one of those – it’s something my mother told me a long time ago – that I threaten things that I don’t carry out.

Many of the responses including the theme of lecturing also were coded for other themes. As seen in the descriptions above, parents described several variants of lecture. Closely related, the next more common theme was negotiation. This theme was coded for responses in which the parent engaged a child in a two-way dialogue about their behavior, to determine together how to handle it. Parents described including the child’s viewpoint to varying degrees, as demonstrated in these examples:

If they have offended somebody, I encourage them to apologize. If it is something that I feel needs physical punishment, I apply physical punishment. If I think that it is something that I could actually speak with them over it, and let them reason over what they have done, then I do that. But usually it depends on what misbehavior has been done.”

You need to talk to the child, dissuade the child, let the child understand the reason why it was wrong and by so doing, the child will also appreciate that there will be no need for violence to be visited on him or her. And in a way, it helps the child in the future to be a nonviolent person.

Well, I think there will be no need for me to scream, to start pointing fingers, or accusing the child. If and when I know the child is at fault, I will always want the child to tell me his or her side of whatever it is at that moment, and then we take it from there.

Listen to the child and let the child listen to you. Give your opinions on the issue and let the child think about it. Take the good from what you have experienced, and let them come back to you and tell you what it is they plan to do.
Aside from lecture or negotiations, some parents described invoking religion to make their point. Four parents (13%) described some reference to religion to inform the process of discipline, as well as to frame the child’s misbehavior in a moral context of intentionality of the wrong. These responses illustrated how a parent explains to a child that their misbehavior is sinful, or offends God in some way, and might include a statement related to punishment from God:

I used to tell them Jesus doesn’t like bad children, this is what I used to say. So, if you want to be a good child, be a good child and Jesus will love you. Mom and dad will never beat you if you do the right thing… So, if you told them this talk, you scare them once, and then they do stop it.”

For example, if they tell a lie, I’ll tell them God doesn’t like that, Jesus doesn’t like that, He says that’s a lie. You won’t be Jesus’ friend. You wouldn’t be mommy’s friend or you wouldn’t be Jesus’ friend.”

For certain problems, parents described invoking religion to instill fear or respect, as well as engage religious solutions to the problem. The following response exemplified this idea that some misbehaviors must be punished or the child must apologize, but the child won’t be punished as severely if he or she is trying to change.

If it’s a habit, then they have to be praying about it.

Several parents referenced rewarding good behavior, but only one parent (3%) did so clearly enough to merit reliable coding of this response. The example this parent gave described using rewards instead of punishments to encourage good behavior.
Yes, I do talking. I don’t really punish, I feel sometimes. I tell them from Monday to Friday if you are not going to mistake if you are not going to fight or do anything silly, this is what I am going to do for you: reward. And if I say that for the whole week they will be good and they will be looking forward to their reward. Sometimes I buy them a pop or chocolates. Sometimes maybe, they need a very nice Sunday sweater or particular shoes that they want me to buy for them. If I want to give, then I’ll buy it, then I do it.

Some parents explained that in certain situations, they don’t need to utilize any type of punishment of reward to shape their children’s behavior. Instead, they simply give nonverbal cues that they are displeased or angry. One parent (3%) described this in enough detail to be reliably coded.

You can even use expression – when he misbehaves and you look at him. Depending upon the way you look at him... he knows that you don’t like the way he behaved or misbehave so he will go away from that behavior that he put up which you wasn’t happy with.
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